

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. XVII.

MAY, 1897.

No. 1.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF INFANT SALVATION.

BY PROFESSOR B. B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D.

(*In five parts.*)

PART III.

The Anglican Position.

A SIMILAR difficulty has been experienced by all types of Protestant thought in which the Roman idea of the Church, as primarily an external body, has been incompletely reformed. This may be illustrated, for example, from the history of opinion in the Church of England. The Thirty-nine Articles in their final form are thoroughly Protestant and Reformed. And many of the greatest English theologians, even among those not most closely affiliated with Geneva, from the very earliest days of the Reformation, have repudiated the "scrupulous superstition"¹ of the Church of Rome as to the fate of infants dying unbaptized. But such repudiation neither was immediate, nor has it ever been universal. And it must needs be confessed that

¹ *Reform. Legum*; de Baptismo: "Illorum etiam videri debet scrupulosa superstitio, qui Dei gratiam et Spiritum Sanctum tantopere cum sacramentorum elementis colligant, ut plane affirmant, nullum Christianorum infantem salutem esse consecuturum, qui prius morte fuerit occupatus, quam ad Baptismum adduci potuerit: quod longe secus habere judicamus." This code of laws seems to have been drawn up by a commission with CRANMER at the head of it. It was published by PARKER in 1571.

this "scrupulous superstition" was so deeply imbedded in the forms of the Book of Common Prayer, that it has survived all the changes which successive revisions have brought to its language, and remains to-day the natural implication of its Baptismal Offices.

The history of the formularies of the Church of England begins with the publication in 1536 of the somewhat more than semi-Romish *Articles devised by the Kinges Highnes Majestie, to stablyshe Christen quietnes and unitie amonge us, and to avoyde contentious opinions, which articles be also approved by the consent and determination of the hole clergie of this realme*,¹ commonly known as the "Ten Articles." These Articles explicitly teach the twin doctrines of baptismal regeneration and the necessity of baptism for salvation. Among the things which "ought and must of necessity" be believed regarding baptism, they tell us, is "that it is offered unto all men, as well infants as such as have the use of reason, that by baptism they shall have remission of sins, and the grace and favour of God;" that it is "by virtue of that holy sacrament" that men obtain "the grace and remission of all their sins;" and that it is "in and by this said sacrament" which they shall receive," that "God the Father giveth unto them, for His son Jesus Christ's sake, remission of all their sins, and the grace of the Holy Ghost, whereby they be newly regenerated and made the very children of God." Accord-

¹ "As seen by us, from the position we now occupy," says HARDWICK (*A History of the Articles of Religion*, etc. Third ed. revised by the Rev. FRANCIS PROCTER, M.A., etc. London: Bell, 1876, p. 42), "these articles belong to a transition-period. They embody the ideas of men who were emerging gradually into a different sphere of thought, who could not for the present contemplate the truth they were recovering, either in its harmonies or contrasts, and who consequently did not shrink from acquiescing in accommodations and concessions, which to riper understandings might have seemed like the betrayal of a sacred trust." Dr. SCHAFF repels DIXON's description (*History of the Reformation*, i., p. 415) of these articles as bearing "the character of a compromise between the old and the new learning." "They are essentially Romish," he says (*Creeds of Christendom*, i., 611), "with the Pope left out in the cold;" and he endorses Foxe's characterization of them (which Hardwick deprecates) as intended for "weaklings, which were newly weyned from their mother's milke of Rome."

ingly they "ought and must of necessity" also believe that "the sacrament of baptism was instituted and ordained in the New Testament by our Saviour Jesu Christ, as a thing necessary for the attaining of everlasting life;" that original sin cannot be remitted "but by the sacrament of baptism;" and that, therefore, since "the promise of grace and everlasting life (which promise is adjoined unto this sacrament of baptism) pertaineth not only unto such as have the use of reason, but also to infants, innocents, and children," they "ought therefore and must needs be baptized," and "by the sacrament of baptism, they do also obtain remission of their sins, the grace and favour of God, and be made thereby the very sons and children of God;" "insomuch as infants and children dying in their infancy shall undoubtedly be saved thereby, and else not."¹ The express assertion of the loss of all unbaptized infants included in these last words was taken over from the "Ten Articles" into *The Institution of the Christian Man*, commonly called "The Bishop's Book," which was published in 1537;² and thence, though with the omission of the final words in which the statement reaches its climax, into *The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of Any Christian Man*, commonly called "The King's Book," which was published in 1543.³ Here its career in the doctrinal formularies ceased.

But it still had a part to play in the liturgical forms of the Church of England. The first *Book of Common Prayer* was published in 1549, and in it, among the rubrics which precede the Order of Confirmation, is found this paragraph: "And that no man shall think that any detriment shall come to children by deferring of their confirmation: he shall know for truth, that it is certain by God's word, that children being baptized

¹ The full text may be conveniently read in HARDWICK, as above, p. 242 sq.

² The text may be seen in Bishop LLOYD's *Formularies of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII.*, p. 1.

³ *Ibid.* Cf. FRANCIS PROCTER, *A History of the Book of Common Prayer*, etc. 15th ed. London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1881, pp. 384, 385, note 1.

(if they depart out of this life in their infancy) are undoubtedly saved." In the Prayer Book for 1552 this was so far altered that its latter portion reads "that children being baptized have all things necessary for their salvation, and be undoubtedly saved," and so it stands in the Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559, and substantially in later issues, until in the Prayer Book of 1661 it was transferred to the end of the order for the Public Baptism of Infants in the form: "It is certain by God's Word, that Children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." Thus it still remains in the Book of Common Prayer according to the use of the Church of England, although it has dropped out of the Prayer Book according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

The successive alterations in this statement, no doubt, mark in a general way the growing Protestant sentiment in the Church of England, although it is noteworthy that the omission of the most obnoxious words, "and else not," in which the condemnation of unbaptized infants, dying in infancy, is made express, first occurs in the reactionary "King's Book," while the effect of the transposition of the rubric from the Confirmation Service to that for Baptism, which took place so late as 1661, was distinctly reactionary. Its primary effect, standing in the Confirmation Service, was to declare that confirmation is not necessary to salvation; and any implication which may be thought to reside in the words of the necessity of baptism to salvation was entirely incidental. While, standing at the end of the Baptismal Service, its primary effect seems to be to declare the certain efficacy of baptism when administered to infants, and the implication of the loss of the unbaptized infants dying in infancy is certainly

¹ *The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552, etc., edited for the Parker Society, by the Rev. JOSEPH KETLEY, M.A., etc.* (Cambridge, 1844, p. 121).

² *Ibid.*, p. 295. The two may be found together in *The Two Books of Common Prayer set forth . . . in the Reign of King Edward the Sixth*, by EDWARD CARDWELL, D.D., etc. (Oxford, 1852, p. 544).

more natural, even if not necessary. The explanation of this reactionary alteration is to be found, of course, in the general spirit which governed the revision of 1661, which not only was hostile to the more Protestant party in the Church, but was determined upon all possible insult and degradation to it.¹

The more Protestant party had, of course, never been satisfied with this rubric, and it had, of late, necessarily received its share of criticism. The committee of divines appointed by the House of Lords in 1641 had proposed the omission from it of the words "and be undoubtedly saved." The Presbyterian divines at the Savoy Conference had commented on it: "Although we charitably suppose the meaning of these words was only to exclude the necessity of any other sacraments to baptized infants; yet these words are dangerous as to the misleading of the vulgar, and therefore we desire they may be expunged."² The answer of the bishops was not conciliatory: "It is evident that the meaning of these words is, that children baptized, and dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved, though they be not confirmed: wherein we see not what danger there can be of misleading the vulgar by teaching them truth. But there may be danger in this desire of hav-

¹ Observe how even CARDWELL speaks of the general spirit of this revision (*A History of Conferences and other Proceedings connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer*, etc. Third ed. Oxford, 1849, pp. 387 sq.) and the warning he draws from it (pp. 463 sq.): "Let it be remembered, also, on the part of nonconformists, that whenever objection is made against any expressions as ambiguous or indefinite, other parties, of different and even opposite opinions, will be as ready as they themselves are, to offer amendments. In such a case, the result will probably be that phrases, which had previously afforded a common shelter to both, will be made precise and contracted in accordance with the wishes of the more rigid interpreters. Let it be remembered that if one party complain of a strict adherence to forms and a tendency toward superstition, another party, more compact, more learned, and more resolute, may call for the restoration of prayers and usages which once found a place in the liturgy, and were removed by the fathers of the reformation as too nearly allied to Romanism."

² CARDWELL, as cited, p. 276.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 327.

ing these words expunged, as if they were false ; for St. Austin says he is an infidel that denies them to be true. Ep. 23. ad Bonifac." This defence of the rubric obviously is *ad rem* only in the form and place which it had in the Confirmation Service. When, as was immediately done, it was removed from its place in the Confirmation Service and, curtailed of all reference to confirmation, inserted into the Baptismal Order in the sharply assertive form : " It is certain by God's Word, that Children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved," it must be accounted one of the alterations designed to exclude a Protestant interpretation of the Book of Common Prayer ; and, in the intention of the authors of the change at all events, as no longer open to be understood as not implying the necessity of baptism for salvation but only asserting that confirmation is not necessary to salvation. It was obviously intended by those who gave it its present form and place to assert baptismal regeneration, and to leave whatever implications the doctrine of baptismal regeneration may include as the natural teaching of the rubric.

Nor can it be denied that, as assertorial of baptismal regeneration, the rubric finds a very natural place in the Book of Common Prayer. It was inevitable that in the beginning of the Reformation movement

¹ CARDWELL, as cited, p. 358. The reference to AUGUSTINE is to Ep. 98 in the Benedictine enumeration (§ 10). Augustine is discussing the propriety and effect of baptism prior to the exercise of active faith on the part of the recipient, and says : " During the time in which he is by reason of youth unable to do this, the sacrament will avail for his protection against adverse powers, and will avail so much on his behalf, that if before he arrives at the use of reason he depart from this life, he is delivered by Christian help, namely, by the love of the Church, commending him through the sacrament unto God, from that condemnation which by one man entered into the world. He who does not believe this, and thinks that it is impossible, is assuredly an unbeliever, although he may have received the sacrament of faith : and far before him in merit is the infant which, though not yet possessing a faith helped by the understanding, is not obstructing faith by any antagonism of the understanding, and therefore receives with profit the sacrament of faith" (translation of the Rev. J. G. CUNNINGHAM, M.A., in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, first series, vol. i., p. 410).

remainders of the unreformed doctrine of baptismal regeneration should intrench themselves in the liturgical offices of the Church. As a matter of fact, the assumption of this doctrine underlay a good deal of the language relative to baptism in the first Prayer Book (1549).¹ This may be true even of the words of the opening address which recite the fact of original sin, and declare that "no man born in sin can enter into the kingdom of God (except he be regenerate and born anew of water and the Holy Ghost)." It is more clearly true of the language of the opening prayer where the figure of baptism found in the flood and the passage through the Red Sea, is developed rather on the negative than on the positive side; and God is besought, therefore, to look mercifully upon these children, "that by this wholesome laver of regeneration, whatsoever sin is in them may be washed clean away; that they, being delivered from His wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's church, and so be saved from perishing." Similarly, after "the white vesture" had been given to the child "for a token of the innocence which by God's grace, in this holy sacrament of baptism, is given unto it," the priest was to bless the child in the name of the God "who hath regenerate it by water and the Holy Ghost, and hath given unto it remission of all its sins." When a child privately baptized was brought to the church for the priest to examine whether it had been lawfully baptized, if it were so decided, the minister was to certify the parents of their well-doing in having the child baptized, because it "is now, by the laver of regeneration in baptism, made the child of God, and heir of everlasting life." The same implication naturally underlay also the whole form for the sanctification of the font, which appears only in this earliest of Anglican Prayer Books. In it God is said to have "ordained the element of water for the regeneration of His faithful people," and is asked to sanctify "this fountain of bap-

¹ The quotations that follow are taken from the text as given by CARDWELL, *The Two Books of Common Prayer . . . in the Reign of King Edward the Sixth*, etc., 3d ed. Oxford, 1852, pp. 320 sq.

tism . . . that by the power of His word all those that should be baptized therein might be spiritually regenerated and made the children of everlasting adoption." In the Catechism included in the Confirmation Service, the child is instructed to say that it was in its baptism that it "was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and the inheritor of the kingdom of heaven;" while in the Invocation in the Confirmation Service itself God is addressed as He "who has vouchsafed to regenerate these His servants of water and the Holy Ghost, and also has given unto them forgiveness of all their sins."

The revising hand was, to be sure, as busy with this as with other portions of the Prayer Book. In particular, the opening prayer was already in the second Prayer Book (1552) brought into substantially the form which it still preserves: and this involved not only the omission of the words, "and so saved from perishing"—"expressions," as even Laurence is forced to admit, "too unequivocal to be misconceived," in their exclusion of all unbaptized infants from salvation¹—but also a recasting of the whole tone of the prayer. But the revision was never complete enough to excise the underlying doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and, in the shifting opinion of the Church of England, after a while a reaction set in in its favor, which not only resisted all attempts to eliminate it,² but added new expressions of it.³ So it came about that when the Presbyterians at the Savoy Conference

¹ LAURENCE, *Bampton Lectures for 1804*, rev. ed., Oxford, 1820, p. 71. Compare PROCTER, *A History of the Book of Common Prayer*, 15th ed., 1881, p. 374, note 1; SCHAFF, *Creeks of Christendom*, I., 642.

² It was naturally against this doctrine that the "Puritan party" directed their most persistent objection. See the form of their objections in the documents printed by CARDWELL, *A History of Conferences*, etc., 3d ed., Oxford, 1849, pp. 266, 276, 325, 326; and the answers of the bishops, pp. 357 and 358.

³ For example, the thanksgiving address and prayer after baptism inserted in the Prayer Book of 1552, which declare the baptized child to be regenerate, and the questions, at the end of the Catechism, on the sacraments, added apparently in 1604, which declare that "we are made the children of grace" by baptism.

represented it as a hardship that ministers should "be forced to pronounce all baptized infants to be regenerate by the Holy Ghost, whether they be the children of Christians or not," and protested that they could not "in faith say," as required to say in the Thanksgiving, "that every child that is baptized is 'regenerated by God's Holy Spirit,'" the bishops' reply simply asserts in terms the obnoxious doctrine: "Seeing that God's sacraments have their effects, where the receiver doth not 'ponere obicem,' put any bar against them (which children cannot do); we may say in faith of every child that is baptized, that it is regenerated by God's Holy Spirit." There seems to be little room for doubting, therefore, that these expressions were retained by the revisers of 1661, not as "ambiguous and indefinite," but as distinct enunciations, and just because they were judged to be distinct enunciations, of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. We must adjudge Laurence right, therefore, in finding this doctrine plainly taught in the Book of Common Prayer as now in use; nor can we see how his summing up of the case can be set aside. "In the prayer after Baptism," he says, "every child is expressly declared to be regenerated: 'We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy Church.' And in the Office of private Baptism it is unreservedly stated, that he 'is now by the laver of regeneration in Baptism received into the number of the children of God, and heirs of everlasting life.' That all baptized children are not nominally, but really, the elect of God, our Church Catechism likewise distinctly asserts. Q. 'Who gave you that name?' A. My Godfathers and Godmothers in my Baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.' . . . Nor is the position, that an actual regeneration always takes place confined to our Baptismal service, but also

¹ CARDWELL, as cited, pp. 276, 325; cf. 326.

Ibid., p. 356.

subsequently recognized in the Order of Confirmation, the first prayer of which thus commences: 'Almighty and everlasting God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water, and the Holy Ghost,' etc. "Surely," he adds, with some justice, "it requires something more than a common share of ingenuity to pervert language like this from its plain grammatical sense, into one directly repugnant."¹

On the basis of this doctrine of Baptismal regeneration, thus clearly implied in her forms of worship and firmly retained in their latest revision, the Church of England is justified in asserting with the emphasis which the rubric at the close of the Baptismal Service asserts it, that "it is certain" "that Children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." Whether, however, this assertion, as Laurence contends, carries with it no implication of the loss of those who die unbaptized, is more questionable.² The mere change of language from the earlier form of "children being baptized" into the more distinguishing seventeenth-century form of "children which are baptized," bears a contrary suggestion. And the arguments which Laurence adduces from the known opinions of Cranmer and his coadjutors, and from the elimination from the earlier forms, under their hand, of phrases which assert the necessity of baptism to salvation, are vitiated by the fatal flaw that he neglects to distinguish times and seasons.³ That the leaders of the Reformation in England advanced rapidly from a semi-Romish, through a Lutheran, to a Reformed stage of opinion, and that their

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 440, 441.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 70 and 176. Laurence contends that "the Reformers" intended by the language of the Prayer Book in no way "to establish any opinion inconsistent with the salvation of infants unbaptized:" "the very reverse of this is the fact," he thinks. And thus it has become customary to speak. So, *e.g.*, PROCTER, *Op. cit.*, p. 384, note 1: and even BLUNT, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1866), ii., 230, although himself inclining to believe the loss of all infants dying unbaptized. These opinions would seem, however, to be too little determined by historical considerations. See further below.

³ In some cases also his knowledge of historic facts was defective.

handiwork in the public formularies of the Church bears traces of this growth, is true enough. But it does not follow that every product of their labors must, therefore, have left their hands in a form which represents their highest attainments in doctrinal thought; or that every one has reached us in the precise form which they gave it. That much that was inconsistent with the better thought of the Protestant world was eliminated from the first Prayer Book of 1549 in its passage through the Book of 1552 to the Elizabethan Book of 1559 is thankfully to be recognized. But it must needs be recognized also that much was left in it which was scarcely consistent with the higher point of view which had been only gradually attained by the Reformers themselves; and that in the reactionary revision of the seventeenth century this unreformed element was even increased.¹

¹ It must be thankfully recognized also that a more complete reformation of doctrinal statement was accomplished in the doctrinal formularies of the Church of England than in her devotional forms. This is probably due to the singular discontinuity in the growth of the doctrinal formularies, by which the later Articles were saved from corruption through inheritance from the earlier and more tentative attempts to state the reformed faith. The first Prayer Book (1549) stands at the basis of and contributes its substance to the whole series of Prayer Books. But the first doctrinal formularies, the "Ten Articles" and the "Bishop's" and "King's Books," though they contributed to the Prayer Book the very rubric in which the assertion of baptismal regeneration reaches its climax, had little effect on the development of the "Articles of Religion." For them, an entirely new beginning was made in the "Thirteen Articles" of 1538, which were formed under Lutheran influence and rather on the basis of Lutheran than earlier Anglican formularies. In these Articles the Lutheran doctrine of the sacraments, of course, finds expression, and is sometimes even strengthened. In Article 2, for example, it is asserted that original sin condemns and brings eternal death "to those who are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit." In Article 4 it is declared that "by the word and sacraments, as by instruments, the Holy Spirit is given, who effects faith when and where it seems good to God, in those who hear the Gospel." These statements came from the Augsburg Confession. Article 6, "on Baptism," teaches, in the words of the Augsburg Confession, that "baptism is necessary to salvation, and by baptism remission of sins and the grace of Christ are offered to infants and adults." Then it is added that "by baptism infants receive remission of sins and grace and are the children of God," and "that the Holy Spirit is efficacious even in infants and cleanses them"—a statement which is repeated

Whatever may be thought, however, of the implications of the doctrine taught in the Prayer Book, this much is at least certain—that the formularies of the Church of England hold out absolutely no hope for the salvation of infants who die unbaptized. They assert with great strength of language the certainty of the salvation of all baptized children dying in infancy. As to those who die unbaptized, they at the least preserve a profound silence. "This assertion," says Mr. Francis Procter, the learned historian of the Book of Common Prayer, "carefully avoids all mention of children unbaptized. . . . Our Reformers are intending to speak only of that which is revealed—the covenanted mercy of Almighty God."¹ Whence we may learn that, in the judgment of Mr. Procter at least, the Prayer Book knows of no covenanted mercy of God for children dying before baptism, and can find nothing in God's revealed word which will justify an assured hope for them. In the same spirit is conceived the comment in Mr. Blunt's *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, which runs as follows: "Neither in this Rubric, nor in any other formulary of the Church of England, is any decision given as to the state of infants dying without Baptism. Bishop Bethell says [*Regeneration in Baptism*, p. xiv.] that the common opinion of the

in Article 9. These Articles were never published, and have influenced the development of the Articles of the Church of England only through their use by the framers of the Forty-two Articles of 1553. The first draught of these was from the hand of Cranmer himself, and reflects his more advanced Reformed opinions, deriving practically nothing from former Articles except where the "Thirteen Articles" have been drawn upon. In the portions at least which have been retained in the Thirty-nine Articles the influence of even the "Thirteen Articles" has affected rather language than doctrine, in which latter particular the new Articles follow Reformed rather than Lutheran modes of statement. If the language of the "Thirteen Articles," by which the sacraments are said, "as by instruments," to convey the Holy Spirit who effects faith, seems to be repeated here in the Article on Baptism (Art. 28 of 1553, 27 of 1563-71), it is along with an important caveat by which the effect is confined "to those that receive baptism rightly." By this the stress is thrown rather on the subjective attitude of the recipient than on the mere reception of the rite.

¹ *A History of the Book of Common Prayer*, etc., 15th ed. (London and New York, 1881), p. 384, note 1.

ancient Christians was, that they are not saved : and as our Lord has given us such plain words in John iii. 5, this seems a reasonable opinion. But this opinion does not involve any cruel idea of pain or suffering for little ones so deprived of the Sacrament of new birth by no fault of their own. It rather supposes them to be as if they had never been, when they might, through the care and love of their parents, have been reckoned among the number of those 'in whom is no guile,' and 'who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth.'"¹ This position has indeed the best right to be called the historical understanding of the Church of England as to the teaching of her Prayer Book, as we may be advised by the statement of it by the great historian of infant baptism, William Wall, writing indeed two hundred years ago, but putting into his carefully chosen and sober language just what as we have seen the best accredited expounders of the Prayer Book in our own day repeat. "The Church of England," says Wall, "have declared their sense of its [*i.e.* baptism's] necessity by reciting the saying of our Saviour, John iii. 5, both in the Office of Baptism of Infants and also in that for those of riper years. . . . Concerning the everlasting state of an infant that by misfortune dies unbaptized, the Church of England has determined nothing (it were fit that all churches would leave such things to God) save that they forbid the ordinary *Office for Burial* to be used for such an one ; for that were to determine the point and acknowledge him for a Christian brother. And though the most noted men in the said Church from time to time since the Reformation of it to this time have expressed their hopes that God will accept the purpose of the parent for the deed ; yet they have done it modestly and much as Wycliffe did, rather not determining the negative than absolutely determining the positive, that such a child shall enter into the kingdom of heaven."

The Church of England holds thus the unenviable

¹ *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, etc., edited by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, M.A., F.S.A., etc. (London, 1866), ii., 230.

² *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, ed. 2, 1707, p. 377.

place among Protestant churches of alone of them having no word of cheer to say as to the destiny of the children of Christian parents who depart from this world without baptism. There is no covenant with reference to them ; it may be that they may be saved—but if so, she is sure she cannot tell how ; or if they be not saved, it may be that they may be “ as if they had never been :” there is no word of God with reference to them. Surely this is all cold comfort enough. And if this is all that can be said of the children of the faithful, lacking baptism, where will those of the infidel appear ?

SOME RECENT ENGLISH THEOLOGIAN:
LIGHTFOOT, WESTCOTT, HORT, JOWETT,
HATCH.

BY A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), March, 1897.

(*In two parts.*)

PART II.

III.

BUT we turn from Jowett to the younger scholar whose work suggested this paper, Edwin Hatch. Of his hard struggle for a foothold and even a livelihood, of his long unrecognised merit and unrewarded labours, I will not venture to speak. For years, even after he had attained European fame, he was allowed to hold the office of Vice-Principal of St. Mary Hall, which may fitly be described as the least of all the cities of Judah ; and even at one time he was forced to undergo the exhausting and depressing drudgery of taking private pupils. When University recognition did come it was parcelled out in small offices, which in most cases involved the maximum of uncongenial toil. These things are said only that they may indicate the difficul-

ties under which he did his work ; but they were difficulties that neither broke his temper nor abated his resolution, though, without doubt, they overtaxed his strength and shortened his life. One thing more of a personal nature I will dare to say ; he did not escape the ordinary misjudgment that falls to the men who take their own line in theological inquiry. Men who were party leaders did not love him, and, conscious of his at one time almost unbefriended loneliness, they did not care to conceal their dislike. But, though we had much intercourse and many confidences, I never heard him speak one unkind or ungenerous word of any man among those from whom he had suffered many things. I well remember how an old friend of mine met him at first with some reluctance and much misgiving, because he had been accustomed to hear him described by certain ecclesiastical opponents, one, in particular, whose name occurs elsewhere in this paper, as a man of "a cold and hard nature," of "a rationalistic temper," "without faith in the supernatural," or "feeling for historical continuity in the Church." But my friend, being himself a man of fine character and open eye, learned in the course of a few days' progressively intimate companionship how utterly Hatch had been misconceived and belied. These are things I had no intention of saying when I began this paper, but a man's work can never be really understood unless it be read through his character.

Hatch was not a scholar in the sense and degree in which Lightfoot was one, though his "Essays in Biblical Greek" and the "Concordance to the Septuagint," which he planned, organised the work for, and did so much to carry through, show how much he could have accomplished in the field of constructive scholarship. But Hatch was strong where Lightfoot and Westcott are weak, in using literature for the interpretation of history, in analysing the forces that determine its course, shape its institutions, formulate its beliefs, create its tendencies, regulate its thinking, in a word, govern its development. It is doubtful whether in the delicacy and success with which he handled and ex-

plained the most complex phenomena in early ecclesiastical history, he had a superior or even a peer. His method was scientific, at once analytic and comparative, though, in order to its appreciation, it was necessary to see him at work. He was, in the strict sense, as an historical inquirer without dogmatic assumptions. The Church as it lived and moved, took shape, and grew into an organic structure, was something to be explained, and the only thing which could be regarded as an explanation must come through an analysis of the forces and conditions which had made it. To say that it was in its political and organised, or in its social and secular being a supernatural creation, was to lift it out of the category of things with which the scientific student of history could deal; and such supernatural power could be logically invoked only when every normal and intelligible cause had been tried and failed. To postulate a miraculous cause when historical causes were discoverable and sufficient, was a most needless multiplication of hypotheses. In harmony with this principle, he proceeded to examine the structure, and the several forms or stages through which it passed, in relation to the various conditions under which, and forces amid which, it lived and grew, in order that he might discover whether there were any cause or causes which could account for its organisation by a normal historical process. He began with the ministry, for it was the most obvious point for him to begin at. He lived face to face with a theory of it on which a most portentous series of claims was based, and he was, as it were, every day of his life challenged to accept or contradict the theory. It was characteristic of him to seize on elements and aspects of the idea and functions of the original Christian society which had been overlooked or neglected by ecclesiastical writers. The Church which history revealed to him was not simply a new organ for worship, equipped with the officials, ritual, and authority needed to establish an appropriate cult; but it was rather a ministry of beneficence, a society charged to create a new order, where the distinction of bond and free should cease, and to exercise

those charities which made the poor share in the abundance of the rich. He examined the guilds and religious associations of the Græco-Roman world ; he compared their constitution with the constitution of the Church, and found analogies that made it probable that the new Christian societies were not dissimilar from the old associations. Then he examined the Jewish communities, found special features in their administration, "elders" who formed a "synedrion," or local court, which had many points of similarity with the Roman municipalities, and these, in their union, became transformed into the council of the Church. The process was then analysed by which the bishop rose to supremacy, the clergy and laity came to be differentiated, and the Church organised on the lines of the empire. It was a study in ecclesiastical biology, the formation of the clerical orders dealt with as a problem in natural history. And its success may be measured by two things—the violence with which it was assailed, on the one side, and the admiration with which the most competent and dispassioned judges received it, on the other. One thing must have been peculiarly gratifying to Hatch—the letter which in the September of 1886 he received from Hort :

"On the question of organisation, I imagine that we agree more than we differ ; but some of your language is not such as I should naturally use. I quite go with you in condemning the refusal of fellowship with sister Churches merely because they make no use of some elements of organisation assumed to be *jure divino* essential. But it seems to me that the rejection of theoretical and practical exclusiveness clears the ground for the recognition of at least the possibility that other kinds of (relative) *jus divinum* may be brought to light by history and experience. In organisation, as in other things, all Churches have much, I think, to learn from each other, the Church of England as much as any. It does not follow that organisation ought to be everywhere identical. But it may well turn out that there are some elements or principles of organisation which cannot anywhere be cast aside without injury ; and, at all events, each Church has need to ask how far its peculiarities may be mere gratuitous defects, not right adaptations to its own special circumstances."¹

What this means is obvious enough ; it showed that Hatch stood no longer alone. The man he regarded

¹ Hort's "Life and Letters," ii. p. 357.

as in the region of literary and historical criticism, the most capable, detached, and constructive intellect of the English Church, substantially agreed with him. To Hort, as to him, a special organisation was not of the *esse*, though it might be of the *bene esse* of the Church; it did not forbid "fellowship with sister Churches," or justify "theoretical and practical exclusiveness." What Hort desiderated was "practical tolerance and practical brotherliness," and he regretted that "Anglican prejudice and exclusive theory" barred the way, but felt that even they "needed tender handling if their power is to be sapped."¹ Reflection and research had effected a revolution in the quondam High Churchman which his son and biographer has not appreciated or even perceived.

But Hatch did not imagine that to trace the organisation of the ministry was to explain the Church. On the contrary, the Church represented to him a most complex growth, and was a highly complicated structure. As he conceived the matter, it was not explained at any point unless it was explained at all. The Bampton Lectures were but a small section of a much greater whole; they did not express his complete view or cover the field within which he had pursued his researches. They were not his solution of the problem, but only a step toward it. The Hibbert Lectures carried the problem another step forward, but in the mind of their author no more than a single step. Their special question was as to "the influence of Greek ideas and usages upon the Christian Church;" but the question had so many ramifications and raised so many issues that adequate discussion of any one, let alone all, within the limits allowed him, was simply impossible. As it was, the ease and force of his exposition enabled him to perform a task that would have been to any less well-furnished mind simply impossible. He analysed the medium or soil in which Christianity had to live when it became the religion of the Gentiles. The mind that assimilated also transformed the religion, and

¹ Hort's "Life and Letters," ii., p. 353.

the transformation was only explicable through the mind that accomplished it. He sketched the Greek mind as it was in the first and second centuries of our era, how it was educated and exercised, what its interests were, and what sort of life it led, and indicated the relation in which the habit of mind created by the vagrant philosophers who speculated and argued in public and preached so as to gratify curiosity, tickle the fancy, and exercise the understanding, stood to the new system which came to claim belief in ways so instructively analogous to the old. He examined the methods of exegesis which had been used to extract reason from Greek mythology and to reconcile Moses and Plato, and which in due season became in the hands of the Fathers now a weapon of apology, now a means of proving doctrine, and now the instrument of bringing the New Testament out of the Old. He analyzed the action of philosophy on the Greek mind, and traced its influence on the tendency to speculate and define in the region of belief. He showed the distinction between Greek and Christian ethics, and indicated how the Greek penetrated, changed, in some respects superseded, the Christian. Then he traced how the region of theology proper, man's intellectual interpretation of God as the highest and most real Being, was invaded by the metaphysical Greek mind with its inherited instincts, its well-disciplined habits, and its elaborate terminology, with the result that the faith of the Church in a living personal God was transmuted into a series of abstract yet vigorously defined dogmas. The Greek mysteries, it was further argued, had affected the Christian sacraments, changing them from their simple primitive sense and purpose to acts and ceremonies akin to those associated with the ancient secret cults. The result of the whole was the transformation of the original basis of the Christian society, and a correspondent change in the whole structure it supported.

Immense and intricate as the problem was, it by no means adequately or fairly represented the question he had put to himself, and the material he had collected

for its discussion. He did not imagine that the Church had been explained when, as in the Bampton and Hibbert Lectures, the forces contributing to the formation of its ministry, the formulation of its creed, the rise of its mysteries, and the evolution of its ethics have been analysed and described. Other and quite as integral elements in its constitution had still to be reckoned with. The action of Roman law, of the civil organisation of the empire and its administration, of its religious legislation and institutions, had still to be traced. There was the constitution of the Church, catholic and provincial, national and parochial, the functions and powers of councils and synods as affected by the imperial system, now independent of the emperor, now dependent upon him, and the whole remarkable body of legislation called the Canon Law to be explained. There were also to be traced the changes which the growth and application, the consolidation and codification of this law effected in the discipline, in the internal organisation and the external policy, both of provincial Churches and the Roman Church. And in the light thus shed it became more possible to discover the state and influence of the localities where given synodical or conciliar canons had been framed ; to watch the development of the clerical orders and the definition of their authority ; to study the methods of the Church in dealing with offences, ecclesiastical and moral, lay and clerical, the manners, conduct, vices of special classes, places and times, the relation and reciprocal action of Church and State, with the increasing emphasis on the monarchical idea in the one, and the changes due to the weakness or the strength of the imperial or regal power in the other ; to ascertain the attitude of city to surrounding country, and of province to capital, with its correlative action in the creation of diocesan episcopacy. And he had made large researches and collected considerable material toward a history of these things, though nothing more than the merest hints as to his conclusions and fragments of his work ever saw the light.

These are dry records of the streams of fertilising

light which he poured into dark places well known to scholasticism, dead and living, but all too seldom visited by science. In his hands the study of Canon Law, as some of us remember it, was distinguished by vivid reality. He made one see the Church as she lived in the age when the special canons, whether of a council or a synod, which he was at the time studying, were framed, the age she lived in, the difficulties she had to meet, and her mode of meeting them. And the study was always comparative; the new canons were examined in relation to the old, and the action of the whole on the constitution and history of the Church carefully traced. By his method he made us see, as if it were going on under our very eyes, the whole process of organic change, which transformed the free Christian societies of Syria, Greece, and Italy, into a new empire, ecclesiastical and Roman. He did not describe the process with Harnack as the secularisation of the Church, or with Sohm as its naturalisation¹ (the natural man is a born Catholic, "Church Law has risen from the overpowering desire of the natural man for a legally constituted, *catholicised* Church"); but the process certainly appeared as one of progressive alienation from the primitive ideal. Nor did Canon Law exhaust his question. Over against it stood two very different classes of phenomena, one in the region of opinion, represented by the Heresies, another in the region of emotion, and worship represented by the Liturgies. The growth of legislation made the Church partake more and more of a political character, and heresy appear more and more as a political crime; and I have no more instructive recollection than a private discussion with Hatch, in which he illustrated the influence which the ideas Augustine had derived from these two sources—the political idea of the Church and the criminal character of heresy—had on his mind and system. His discussions of the Liturgies brought him into a deeper and more sacred region; but he so handled the

¹ "Outlines of Church History," pp. 35, 36. This position is most elaborately and learnedly worked out in Sohm's great work on "Kirchenrecht," vol. i.

question as to make the Liturgies illustrate the growth at once of religious ideas and of customs, especially as concerned the relations of clergy and people.

The whole of the question he had set himself to solve he was never able to discuss publicly, or even in his university lectures. And so much as he did publicly discuss was in a form that hardly enabled him to do justice to his mind. What I have called the immense and intricate problem of the "Hibbert Lectures" was treated in a book of only 350 pages, originally given as a series of twelve lectures, each being of about an hour's duration. Looked at thus, the attempt might seem to say more for Hatch's courage than for his discretion. But he knew himself so well, felt so much the brevity and uncertainty of life, believed so thoroughly that truth could best be served by early and frank discussion, that he did not feel as if he had any choice. And the death which came so soon and sadly showed that he was wise. But he felt strongly that his argument depended for its cogency on its evidence, that the evidence was cumulative, and that its strength could only be fully appreciated when its lines had all been drawn out and mustered and marshalled in force. It was, therefore, signally unfortunate that his theory and its proof came out, as it were, piecemeal, especially as his style and manner of exposition increased the evil. He threw himself upon his subject, labored at its elucidation, seemed to think of it alone, and of how best to compel others to think of it as he did. The result was a fine lucidity, a brisk incisiveness and cogency, which made it easy to follow his meaning, though it hid from the polemical or the undiscerning much of his implied but unexpressed mind. As a result, he had more than his share of misconception and irrelevant criticism. His theory of the ministry was criticised from assumptions as to his beliefs which he would not have admitted, and on the basis of a localisation of the divine energy and an externalisation of the means of grace which he would have vehemently denied. His opponents spoke as if he did not believe in the supernatural character of the Church, while, as a

matter of fact, his supernatural was larger than theirs, not limited and defined by external organs, but expressed in the whole of history and in the lives of men. His purpose was as positive as any problem in science ; it was to seek from history an answer to this question : *How and why* has the Church, as a whole and in its several parts, become what it is ? But his critics—though only so far as they were English, his Continental critics understood him better—assumed his purpose to be polemical or controversial, and not merely historical and scientific ; and they answered him as the person they assumed him to be. He spoke of himself as having " ventured as a pioneer into comparatively unexplored ground," and confessed that he had no doubt " made the mistakes of a pioneer ;" but he was handled as if his inquiries were a process of dogmatic affirmation toward a predestined conclusion. It was complained that he neglected " central and positive evidence in favour of what is external, suggestive, and subsidiary," when, as a simple matter of fact, his evidence was as " central" as it could be for his own purpose, though his purpose was not that of his critics. The very title of his Hibbert Lectures, the " Influence of Greek Ideas on the Church," was forgotten, and he was rebuked as if he had meant that Greek ideas had created as well as helped in the formulation of Christian doctrine. His contention that the Nicene Creed was due to the influence of " Greek metaphysics" was answered by the obvious commonplace, that " Christianity became metaphysical simply and only because man was rational."¹ But so to argue was to answer what he had never questioned, and contradict what he had never affirmed. He had said nothing about metaphysics in general ; but about a special school or type of metaphysics, to wit, " Greek metaphysics"—*i.e.*, the school philosophies of the patristic period, with their elaborate technical terminologies and scholastic methods ; and his problem was to inquire how far these had contributed to the becoming of " the metaphysical creed," which stands

¹ Gore, " Bampton Lectures," p. 21.

in the forefront of the Christianity of the fourth century. The process of production, with its several factors, the worth of the product, the value of its form, and the sufficiency of the form to the ineffable beliefs it would express, are all distinct questions. Dr. Hatch undertook to deal with only one of these, and it was no very relevant reply to deal with him as if he had denied one of the most flagrant facts of human nature.

It lies outside my purpose to examine the criticisms, relevant and irrelevant, made upon his method or his argument; but as I have said so much I may as well say one word more. Canon Gore complains that Hatch in his book on the "Influence of Greek Ideas," left out of consideration the theology of the Apostolic writers.¹ It is so very obvious a criticism that one would have expected an acute critic like Canon Gore to have jealously questioned himself before making it. Surely, if Dr. Hatch's purpose had been, as Dr. Gore supposed, a polemic against doctrine, and not simply, as it was, a historical inquiry into the influence of "Greek Ideas and Usages on the Christian Church," he could not have made a more extraordinary blunder than the omission for which he is censured. It would have been a sort of unconditional surrender of himself into the hands of the enemy. But for his purpose such an inquiry was not necessary, though it seems to me that it would, if it had been prosecuted, have enormously strengthened his contention. He did not analyse the Sermon on the Mount, though he introduced his subject by an allusion to it. He did not attempt an exhibition of the theology of Jesus, though from Dr. Gore's point of view this ought to have been a much more serious omission than even his neglect of "the theology of the Apostolic writers." His work, in reality, begins outside and after the New Testament, though he is never forgetful of its being. It is a matter the student of the primitive Church can hardly be ignorant of, that the development of doctrine does not begin where the New Testament ends; it begins, not

¹ Gore, "Bampton Lectures," pp. 99, 100.

behind it, but without it, though, perhaps, after it, on a lower level, amid influences less strong and less noble than those of the Apostolic circle. It starts with tradition, with confused memories, with blind and stumbling endeavours to comprehend what was said and believed among the multitude, not what had been written and explained by the Apostles. The New Testament might be written at the end of the Apostolic age, but its material had not been assimilated by such Christian mind as then was, had not been fused in the fire of experience, refined by the labour of the intellect or stamped by the hands of thought. Hort would have taught Dr. Gore that a written revelation without "discipular experience" is but a virgin mine, rich in unwrought wealth. To deal, therefore, with the sub-Apostolic age as if it had, or had used, the New Testament, as we have it, or as we use it, or to speak as if the Pauline or the Johannine theology had worked itself into the collective consciousness and become intelligible as a reasonable system or even as an oral tradition, is not to exhibit the historical or scientific spirit, or to show critical comprehension of the man who has followed it. The age when "Greek ideas and usages" began to exercise their influence on Christian thought was an age when for that thought the theology of the New Testament, as we understand the term, could not be said to be. And when it did begin to be, the mind that came to the New Testament was one penetrated by those very Greek ideas whose influence it was the function of the historian to trace. Hence the "leaving out of consideration the theology of the Apostolic writers" seems to us to have been due to a scientific appreciation of the problem; the criticism of the omission to be due to the absence in the critic of a like scientific appreciation and critical sense. In Hatch's own words, he was concerned, not with the "spiritual revelation" which the Apostolic communities had "accepted," but with "the influences" which enabled them to translate what had been thus "accepted" into "an intellectual conviction."

IV.

It is not my purpose to attempt any comparative estimate of the men whose work has been here passed in hurried review. Indeed, only two of them can be fairly compared—Hort and Hatch. They had many points of resemblance, but possibly more of difference; and the differences were the more characteristic. Hort was the more courageous thinker, Hatch the more adventurous inquirer. Hort suffered permanently from the inability to give exact or adequate expression to his mind; Hatch had much of the passion of the explorer who rejoices in the double delight of making discoveries and telling of the discoveries he has made. Hort was fastidious to the last degree; he feared lest he might err, for to his scrupulous intellect the possibilities of error were infinite; he feared to affirm a position lest he should fail to prove it, or lest, on further research, his proofs should turn out false. But Hatch was too much a master at once of historical analysis and constructive synthesis to be deterred by the inadequacy of the tools he must employ, or any defect of skill on his own part in handling them. He was as much alive as Hort to the possibilities of error, but believed that it was better to run the risk of erring than to leave great questions undiscussed; for the way to success lay through failure. He saw as much as Hort the value of good texts, but he also saw that it was the duty of science to work with the materials it had at hand; to wait till its materials were better was the very way to postpone their improvement, was to allow religious inquiry to stagnate, and to cause the methods of research into the past of theology and the Church to fall out of relation to the whole living body of the historical sciences. As a result, little as Hatch accomplished compared with the work he had designed, his published work bears a fairer proportion to his mind as a whole than what Hort has left behind. Hatch did nothing that was in its order so satisfactory and thorough as Hort's work on the text of the New Testament; on the other hand, Hort has not started so

many questions or done so much as Hatch to suggest new problems and new methods to the workers in the field of ecclesiastical history.

But we shall better see the significance and the difference of the two men if we try to seize what we may term their fundamental and regulative ideas. The passion of Hort, we may say, was to conceive Christianity from within, to discover its intrinsic quality and capability, the power by which it penetrated man, and worked out its idea or purpose. We must here speak with caution and reserve, especially as the material for the interpretation of his mind is scanty ; and it has the double disadvantage of being as a whole incomplete, almost chaotic, while single parts have been elaborated with often repeated toil. As he said, "Beliefs worth calling beliefs must be purchased with the sweat of the brow." His idea is embodied, or, let us say, has suffered a sort of incarnation, in the evangelical history. That history is a parable which sets out the mysteries of being ; in it the inmost truths as to God and the universe have so become flesh and dwelt among us that we may even in its visible things behold the glory of the invisible idea. The centre of the system is Jesus Christ ; in Him the whole mystery of God and nature is epitomised, interpreted, realised. His significance for man is measured by man's experience of Him ; the larger and deeper the experience the richer the significance. In the early Church there was a difference between the disciples being present with the Master and the Master being present with the disciples. The record of the former state is in the Synoptists ; the record of the latter is in John. In the Synoptists we see the disciples learning from association with the Master ; in John we see the disciple, all the more a disciple that he is an apostle, enriched in thought because richer in experience, teaching what he has learned through the Master having taken him into association with Himself. The Fourth Gospel is, therefore, neither a supplement nor a correction to the other three ; it is their interpretation, nay, it is the interpretation of the universe, not in the abstract unities of philosophy—which represent

"a corpse god, not a living God"—but in the concrete personalities of religion. All its terms are vivid with reality, "spirit," "light," "love," "way," "truth," "life." In these terms God is conceived, and they are the terms which articulate Christ. "He is not a supplement to belief in God, but the only sure foundation of it." "Impersonal names are dilutions of the truth meeting the weakness of human faculties;" even of God "the personal mode of expression alone is strictly true." God read through Christ ceases to be a silent mystery, the darksome background of our collective insolubilities, and appears as light, and life, and love. These things were realised for time in Christ; through Him they are realised in us; as they are realised in us we are united to God, the living point of unity being the Person who creatively embodied what we are to realise.

This is not a speculative dream, it is a process of experience verified in the life of the disciples of the Church and of the individual. These three experiences repeat and complete each other; that of the disciples is reflected in the Church, that of the Church in the man. The more inchoate the experience, individual or collective, the more confused and the less adequate our apprehension of the divine. "There is a truth within us, to use the language of Scripture, a perfect inward ordering, as of a transparent crystal, by which alone the perfect faithful image of truth without us is brought within our ken." The pure in heart see God; and to create this vision is the function of all we co-ordinate under the term Church. To the eye that can see it, there is here a large philosophy both of religion and of history. The end of all things is the inward vision, but it is late in being reached, and to it many things are necessary that are yet not of it. Outward forms, tradition, systems may be methods of discipline to be used and valued as such, with seasons and functions of their own; but in character they are provisional and transitional. The natural expression of this mood was a large catholicity, to which a political Catholicism grew less and less congenial. As his thoughts deep-

ened they widened, and outward matters he had emphasised in earlier life became much less prominent in his later life. "There is," said he, "no 'Christianity as it is,' but a multitude of Christianities each of which covers but a small part of what is believed in the nineteenth century, while this as a whole excludes much that has been believed in past centuries, and the sum of the whole covers but a part of the contents of the Bible."

"Christianity consists of the most central and significant truth concerning the universe, intelligible only in connection with other truth not obviously Christian, and accepted by many not Christians." "The history of the Church, if it could ever be truly written, would be the most composite of all histories, since it would have to set forth the progress of every element of humanity since its invisible Head was revealed." These broad principles followed from his fundamental conception of the place and function of Christ and the "discipular experience" by which alone He could be interpreted, and show how far he had travelled from the days when he "could almost worship Newman" and imagined himself a High Churchman somewhat in Newman's sense.

Hatch, on the other hand, had a more purely intellectual conception, one more distinctly interpretable, whether by himself or others. He was not a mystic. Nature was not to him a parable, nor was history an allegory which could be read back into its divine realities by the eye which had learned the secret. But he was indeed a very positive thinker, and was for this reason inclined to regard with something severer than impatience those who took accidents of time and place for the very essence of eternal things. God was to him the Spirit who manifested Himself in history through the spirits of men. Character was His creation; ethical distinctions were the most real of things, moral qualities the most sacred. God, as he conceived Him, was too catholic in character, too varied in His activities, too rich in grace to be confined to one society, or to be represented as making certain artificially

created orders of man the covenanted channels of His mercies. The charities and simple beneficences of the early Church seemed to him worthier of the divine than the priestly claims of Cyprian or the offices of the Roman priesthood. To use political distinctions to circumscribe the society of God was opposed as an unjustifiable interference with His modes of action. But he was scrupulously anxious to avoid the speculative determination of history. He would not and did not determine beforehand what the Church was, but he conceived his function to be one of strict historical inquiry. Hence his real contribution to theology was his problem and his method. His problem was: How had the Church—understanding under that term all the institutions, usages, and beliefs which the Christian society had created as at once an expression of its life and the means of its maintenance—come to be? And his method was by an exhaustive historical and comparative analysis to discover how far the home in which it lived, the conditions under which it thought, the forces which worked for or worked against it, were responsible for the formation and development of its peculiar organisation. In other words, it was the application of a rigorously scientific method to a field which science had seldom been allowed to explore. He was permitted to state his problem and illustrate his method only in part, and to reach conclusions which were so far tentative as they were due to a process which was incomplete. But he fell as the "pioneer" falls, who has opened the way to disciples that have learned his secret and are eager to follow in his footsteps.

But here our study of these English theologians must end. They have shown us that the race of the great scholars who were great divines has not yet ceased in England. They were men who were loyal sons of their country and their Church; they have enriched the English mind, adorned the English universities, enhanced the reputation of English scholars, and made even the Christian religion more honourable and more credible by the consecration of all their powers to the

investigation of her history, the study and elucidation of her literature, and the exposition of her beliefs. May not the men of whom these things can be said assure us that the race of the noble and the godly has not yet perished from the earth?

HINTS ON CHURCH REFORM: A REITERATION.

BY THE REV. DR. JESSOPP.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), March, 1897.

(*In two parts.*)

PART II.

IV.

LET us return to our twentieth Article. The twentieth Article sets forth three pregnant postulates, declarative of the main functions which the representative council of the Church is qualified to discharge :

- (1) The Church is a witness and keeper of Holy Writ.
- (2) The Church has the *right* of dealing with questions of rites and ceremonies.
- (3) The Church has *authority* to come to a decision on controversies of faith. On this third head I have nothing to say.

We will confine ourselves to the other two.

As a keeper and witness of Holy Writ, the Church of England during the period between 1530 and 1611 was conspicuous above all Churches in Christendom for its activity in translating the Holy Scriptures into the vernacular, and setting forth or correcting and absorbing the successive versions of Holy Writ which were each improvements upon its predecessors ; until at last the "Authorised Version" was issued in the form in which it is now read in our public worship.

That version underwent no change or improvement of any kind for 270 years.

It was not till May, 1870, that a resolution was passed by the Convocation of Canterbury to the effect "that it is desirable that a revision of the authorised version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken." It was not till 1881 that the first instalment of that improved version was issued by the publication of the revised New Testament with which we are all acquainted. To no living men does the Church of England owe so much as to the two illustrious Bishops of Gloucester and Burham, for the labours which they bestowed, and the influence they exercised upon the remarkable band of scholars associated in the production of that memorable volume. Its appearance marked an era in the history of the Church of England, and it was the best possible evidence of the fact that, after a long sleep, Convocation had at last risen to a sense of its duties, and of its responsibilities as the Council of the Church—roused, that is, to assert itself as the witness and keeper of Holy Writ.

But now that we have that revised version both of the New and of the Old Testament, are we to regard this as the last attempt to deal with the Canon of Holy Scripture? Is the Church of England to accept even that translation as final?—the *terminus ad quem*, and not a *terminus a quo*? Certainly the translators of 1611 can have had no suspicion of the prodigious advance which the science of textual criticism has made during the present century. Let us be cautious how we assume too hastily that in this branch of knowledge we have nothing to learn. So far from it, I cannot but believe that the Church will always need to keep watch and ward over her great charter of Holy Writ, and will never cease to have work to do in the carrying out of this her paramount duty. And if I understand the matter aright, I cannot think that the "keeping of Holy Writ" means no more than the mere translating the sacred Scriptures from the original languages into the vernacular.

V.

But, secondly, the Church (of course speaking and acting through her representative assembly) has the *right* and ought to have the *power* of dealing with questions of rites and ceremonies. She has the *right*, the power has for centuries been withheld. The last occasion when permission was granted to Convocation to exercise the right was in 1661, when the Book of Common Prayer was subjected to a certain amount of revision, and certain additions were made to our liturgy, the most notable and precious being the introduction of the General Thanksgiving into our daily services. The authorship of that noble expression of adoring thankfulness is attributed to Bishop Reynolds of Norwich.

But here again it may be asked, are we satisfied to stop at the point we have reached? Is there no need of revision or addition? No need of supplementing that glorious Liturgy which does not pretend to be anything but *The Book of Common Prayer, i.e.,* of such prayer as is to be offered to the Most High in His sanctuary by all worshippers *in common*? Is it not hard that families living miles away from any church, and to whom it is practically impossible to attend the *daily* service in the house of God, should be left without anything in the shape of a manual of devotion such as may be used in every household, and that the laity should be left to their own devices, left to take their choice of any family prayers they may have the good luck or the bad luck to stumble upon? Is it not hard that there is no collection of private prayers, helpful for devout men and women, when they enter into their chambers, and shut the door, and pray to their Father in secret?¹ And is it not almost harder that the *Pastor in Parochia* should be furnished with no manual to help him in his visitations of the sick, the sad, the troubled

¹ Of the attempt made to supply this want, some few years ago, perhaps the least said the better; but the fact that it was made shows that Convocation as a body had become conscious of the want.

in conscience, the bedridden, the lonely, the bereaved ; but that young men and old men, the men of large experience and the men of none, should be expected to find their own way out of any difficulties that may confront them in dealing with the people committed to their charge?

We learn by our mistakes? Yes! but how about those who suffer from our mistakes? Who can doubt but that the chance of making serious and irrevocable mistakes ought to be minimised as far as may be, and that a wrong is done to—ay! and a wrong suffered by—priests and people if the shepherd of the flock is allowed to take his chance, as we say, and in the most difficult and delicate of his daily duties looks for authoritative direction, some authorized handbook and guide, and looks in vain? But to proceed:

VI.

I had the happiness to serve my apprenticeship after my ordination under one of the most saintly and consistently devout clergymen of the old "Evangelical" school I have ever known. I never can be thankful enough that my ministry began under the influence of such an apostolic character. During those six happy years I and my dear rector always preached in the black gown. It is hardly too much to say that in those days the question of the eastward position had hardly been heard of. As to a stole or a chasuble, or a biretta, or a great many other things that have come into vogue since those days, I really don't think that in the early fifties I could have told any one what they meant. Think of the change that has come upon us since then! I hope and believe that the black gowns now seen in our churches may be counted by very few hundreds, if indeed they count by hundreds at all; and though the eastward position is not yet universal, it is certainly tending that way. But if—mind, I say *if*—it is strictly a violation of the law of the Church for the preacher to use a black gown in his ministrations, and if the eastward position is decided to be the only law-

ful position to be assumed at the sacrament of the altar, I hold it to be a serious breach of discipline for any one to wear his gown in the pulpit or to adopt any position but one at the celebration of the Eucharist. Yet during the last thirty years or so enormous sums have been spent in the law courts to *prevent* clergymen from adopting the eastward position, and how many other clergymen have been more or less cruelly persecuted for wearing the surplice while preaching I cannot tell. On the other hand, I do not know of a single instance of any one being interfered with for wearing the black gown, or for setting at defiance the Archbishop's judgment on the subject of the eastward position.

The fact is, the instinct of compliance with the law has become enfeebled. The law of the land and the law of the Church are enactments which the spirit of revolt—so loud and rampant among us in this generation—seems to be setting itself fiercely to oppose or cunningly to evade. We protest against being coerced to do anything. Men say they have a right to their own opinions upon morals, religion—everything. No ! They have no *right*, though they have the *power*, to take up with every falsehood. A man has the *power* to adopt the opinion that vaccination does his child more harm than good ; the power of asserting that the dropping a little arsenic into his wife's tea will improve her complexion ; the power of insisting that his own health will be bettered by daily doses of *absinthe*. He has no *right* to surrender himself to these wild delusions. The law of the land steps in and imposes its restraints upon him, and in spite of himself protects him from his vagaries by coercing him into obedience to that law. And what reasonable man can doubt that we, who profess to be true sons of the Church of England, are suffering grievously from the want of some power in the Church to enforce discipline among her members, so long as they continue in Church membership ? or that clergy and laity do need to be protected from one another and from themselves ? Yes ! We do need to be protected from the defiant and offensive self-assertion of some of

our clergy at one end of the scale, and from the outrageous and ignorant aggressiveness and the narrowly intolerant dogmatism of too many of our laity at the other. Church reform, when it comes, must bring with it a revival of discipline. Without some power to keep clergy and laity in their places relatively to one another, and to enforce obedience to the Church as set forth for the advantage of all the members of the body, the Church can hardly be said to be an organised society at all.

VII.

It is, however, when we come to look into the financial position of the Church of England as a body possessed—or supposed to be in possession—of property in buildings, houses, and lands, that we begin to see in all its force the paramount necessity of reform. For twenty years I have been asking people in public and in private—in print and by word of mouth—Whom do the churches of England belong to? and I have never yet been able to find an answer to my question. Is it not time that we should press for an answer to the question “Whom do the churches belong to?” To the parish? Take care, my friend! If they are parish property, how long can it be before, as part of the parish property, they are handed over to the Parish Council? And what will the next step be?

But if another should answer “They belong to the Church”? Then we are confronted by the fact that the Church of this land is not a corporation at all. No! Not a corporation holding property, or, as at present constituted, capable of holding it. I infer that the London churches do belong to somebody, for they are being pulled down and sold from year to year, and the proceeds are, I presume, handed over to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. In our country villages we have not yet come to that; in the meantime our village churches, as far as I can see, belong simply to nobody.

But that is not all. I am not less puzzled to answer the next question that occurs to me—viz., Whom do

the tithes of a parish, the glebe lands, and the parsonage houses belong to? I do not get nearly far enough when I am assured that I am myself the tenant for life of my benefice. For in the case of an entailed estate there are always the trustees of the estate behind the tenant for life, and the next tenant in tail can, under certain circumstances, interfere to prevent wanton waste, and restrain the tenant for life from dealing with the estate so as to prejudice his successors. But behind the tenant for life of an ecclesiastical benefice there are no trustees, and almost the only limit to his power of dealing with the property lies in this—that he has no power of sale. He may let the house fall into a ruinous condition; he may let the land fall out of cultivation; he may cut down all the timber and use it to fence round the glebe lands with a park paling; he may sink a shaft in the meadow in search of an imaginary coal mine; he may take to growing hemp on the arable land, and construct a rope-walk on lawn and garden; and then he may die “universally respected by his parishioners,” leaving nothing to recover from his assets by his melancholy successor, the next tenant in tail.

I can see only one way of dealing with this anomalous state of things, only one way of preserving our *churches* from falling into absolute ruin on the one hand or from becoming the prey of ignorant, stupid, and reckless meddlers on the other. And I see only one way of protecting our parsonage houses from being utterly untenable if the days should come (as there is some reason to fear they will come) when the clergy of this Church of England cease to bring more into their benefices than they are getting out of them, and cease to be spenders of their own substance in the cures which they are now supporting, and which ought to be supporting them. What is that remedy? It is a remedy which I proposed some twelve or fourteen years ago in this Review, and which, in principle, I advocate with fuller conviction than I did then; for it strikes at the root of those evils which are becoming every year more crying and more apparent to all.

I would vest the property of all the benefices in England—the houses, the tithes, and the glebe lands—in bodies of trustees who should be managers of that property, they to keep up the repairs, collect the income, and pay the rates and other burdens, not forgetting an *ad valorem* deduction for providing a pension fund or retiring allowance, the net balance to be handed over to the officiating clergyman as his annual stipend.

Every benefice should be treated as a separate estate; there should, by no manner of means, be anything like a robbing of one benefice to supplement the necessities of another. The inequalities in the value of benefices should remain as they are. I believe in Inequality! There is no such thing as equality of endowments in all the Universe of God. One star differeth from another star in glory.

So with the churches. The property in them should be vested in the same, or perhaps in another, body of trustees, and to this body alone should be given the right of moving a single slate in the roof, a single stone in the walls, a single brass on the floor, a single window in the nave, a single ornament in the chancel.

In point of fact, the churches and parsonages would by this reform be put almost exactly on the same footing as the endowed schools were put by the legislation of thirty-five years ago, except in so far as the mistakes which were made in the drafting the acts of parliament which transferred the property of some 1500 endowed schools to the endowed schools commissioners, and the blunders committed in framing too many of these schemes, may serve to warn us against dangers to which every measure of reform at its inception is necessarily obnoxious.

Into details I forbear to go. I am, of course, prepared to be met by objections, from the initial one which starts with a *non possumus* to those minute and captious ones which amount to a *non volumus*. It will be time to deal with such as they arise.

VIII.

But would not such a reform as this *ipso facto* abolish the Parson's Freehold? Yes, and therein lies its chief merit. Does it not turn the parish priest into a stipendiary? Yes, it does. A stipendiary of the Church of which he is a minister, a stipendiary whose stipend is paid to him out of an estate which has become the property of the Church, and of which the parson will no longer be able to claim to be the tenant for life.

The parson's freehold is a survival of ages during which the endowments of every office were looked upon as the property of the holder, however perfunctorily the duties of that office were discharged—a survival from a time when fixity of tenure was assured to every functionary once admitted to the post he held, whether he were a wise man or a fool, a worn-out dotard or an infant in arms. It is an abuse and a scandal which has been kept up in ecclesiastical appointments, and in them only. The parish clerk is irremovable when once admitted to his office by the archdeacon at his visitation. The lay clerk or singing man in our cathedrals is irremovable, though his voice may have passed into a froggy croak or a raucous squall, and he himself be only not as deaf as a post. The chancellor of a diocese is irremovable, though he may take a pride in scornfully flouting his bishop in the newspapers, and persist in issuing marriage licenses which he knows his diocesan would refuse to grant if he were consulted and which he strongly and conscientiously disapproves of. All these picturesque survivals must be swept away, and with them too the parson's freehold. And this brings us back to the subject of the much-needed reform of our Church discipline.

As matters now stand, the only ground on which a clergyman can be dismissed from his cure is that he has been found guilty of some grave moral offence. I am by no means sure that a man could be deprived of his preferment for habitual evil speaking, lying, or slandering, or for very gross neglect of his parishioners, or for many another breach of decorum—to

give such matters as I refer to the mildest possible name.

For conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman an officer in the army is called upon to leave his regiment, and without appeal. For exhibiting incompetence in his profession, a want of presence of mind, or even for an indiscretion or error of judgment, an officer in the navy is brought to a court martial and is dismissed the service. For breaches of professional etiquette a solicitor is struck off the rolls and a barrister is in some cases disbarred. In all these instances there need have been no violation of what we now call the moral law. But in the case of a clergyman he may enjoy all the revenues of his benefice to his dying day—so only that he does not commit theft, murder, or adultery, and this though he may be notoriously and flagrantly unsuited to the place and the people under his charge, and much more nearly a curse than a blessing to the parish in which he lives.¹

And who is the better for all this? Only the bad man who skulks behind the law, and who stands upon his *rights*, forsooth! As if the parson were the only man in the community who had any rights to boast of, and the only man who had no duties which honour and conscience demanded at his hands.

In a paper which I contributed to this Review some ten years ago I roughly sketched out a scheme for regulating the *modus operandi* in cases where it might be judged advisable that a clergyman should be called on to resign his cure. I am as fully convinced as ever that the main principles laid down in that essay are sound and irrefragable; but I have seen reason for being dissatisfied with the methods there tentatively proposed. Meanwhile the principle that the removal

¹ The *Benefices Bill*, introduced into the House of Commons during this Session by Mr. Willox, and set down for a second reading on the 22nd of May, is a measure directed against these evils. But what can be more humiliating to churchmen than that a layman should feel himself called upon to propose such a measure, either because he despairs of the legislative assembly of the Church, or because he despairs of its desire to deal with these evils—whether Convocation be reformed or not?

of a clergyman from his benefice on grounds of mere unsuitability for the post he holds should be made more easy than it is, and in cases where such unsuitability has been proved should be enforced. This principle has been making its way to general acceptance; the appeal to the conscience and the common sense of churchmen has not been made in vain. I doubt not that we could without much difficulty come to an agreement as to the constitution of such tribunals as should be empowered to take action and to adjudicate on the delicate questions that would arise, if only we set ourselves earnestly to look the problem in the face, and gave one another credit for single-mindedness and sincerity, even though we might differ very widely from one another in the discussions that should be carried on.

Let me however, at this point, enter my strong protest against those fiery young Rehoboamites who are for carrying out that bad precedent lately set in the Civil Service, of calling upon every man to resign his benefice simply on the ground of his having reached a certain age—whether it be 65, 70, or even 80. Such hard and fast lines I for one abhor. We want—we always shall want—old men as well as young men in the ministry of Christ's Church. God found splendid work for the great apostle when he had passed his prime—"being such an one as Paul the aged;" and I suspect that "Diotrephes who loved to have the pre-eminence" was a restless and ambitious young curate, who considered that it was time the Apostle of Love should be called on to retire from active work for no other reason than because he was so very old. The men of my generation in their nonage were "kept in their places," as the phrase is; they were told that it was for them to speak when they were spoken to, or not at all. We were snubbed into a galling consciousness of our insignificance. We did not like it, but we are not much the worse for it. If in those bygone days we suffered under the reproach of the odious crime of youth, we did not, when we had proved ourselves guiltless of the charge—No! we did not—retaliate by reproaching our

seniors with the odious crime of *eld*. Let us all beware how we advocate the shelving of all clergymen who have passed the threescore years and ten, only on the ground that they have lived long enough, and *not* on the ground that they have overlived their usefulness. When it has come to that, let a man be called upon to retire whether he be 70 or 40.

IX.

"But if my nominee is to be subject to dismissal from his cure by some newfangled board of control, or whatever else you call it, what becomes of my patronage?"

The reply is very simple: "Friend! your patronage is subjected to limitation and control; which is exactly what is needed."

It matters very little to the public at large, or indeed to anybody but yourself, whether your coachman is deaf or blind or can drive his horses no better than a baby, always provided that you are the only passenger on the buggy. But it is a matter of life and death to other people if they have to sit behind such a charioteer through the long journey. Let it be understood that the patron of a benefice no longer presents to a freehold for life in that benefice, but that he simply nominates a clergyman to take the spiritual oversight of a parish only for so long a time as he shall prove himself fit to discharge the duties of his high calling, and we shall hear no more of buying and selling advowsons and next presentations. The mere suspicion that an *incumbent*¹ had wriggled himself into a benefice by paying cash down would make the bed on which he lies somewhat lumpy; and the fact of his being no longer able to regard himself as irremovable would go some way to make him walk very warily. If he proved himself morally, physically, or even it might be socially or intellectually, quite the wrong man in the wrong place, the money invested—for that is the way people talk

¹ What an oppressively suggestive title!

now—would be lost, and it would require only a very few instances of this kind of thing to convince dealers in church property and clerical agents that an avowson or a next presentation had become an unsaleable article.

I have called this paper a Reiteration. If it were only that and nothing more, I should feel myself, as matters now stand, quite justified in repeating the conclusions at which I have arrived, and "reiterating" them before those who may do me the honour of reading them, and giving them due consideration. If we hope to drive home views that are not generally received views, we *must* force them upon the attention of the indifferent, we *must* repeat our challenge to those who are too timid or too indolent to take up the glove thrown down.

The subject of Church Reform is in the air. We cannot put it out of our thoughts by any or all of those methods of *persiflage* which the languid and half-hearted ones resort to when they want to be left alone. The advocates of *laissez faire* in this matter are at their last gasp. No man can any longer venture to say of the Church of England—meaning by that the ecclesiastical polity of this country as it presents itself to us to-day—"It will last my time!" The real question is "Ought it to last your time?" If it ought, are you prepared to defend it? If it ought not, are you afraid to reform it? Will you continue to denounce as disloyal innovators those who at all costs, and at all risks, and with never a dream of advancing their own interests, have been and are devoting their best energies to bring about the beginnings of reform? Will you hold out to them the right hand of fellowship? At least will you not point out to them where and how they are wrong, and show them a more excellent way?

For me I feel no more fears for the future of this Church of England than I do for the future of our Fatherland. I foresee—and not so very far off—the dawn of a brighter day, of broadening sympathies, of ever-widening activity, of more practical enthusiasm, of

greater triumphs than the past can show us. But it will be a day when this Church of ours shall have shaken herself free from the swathing bands of a childhood protracted too long, from the trammels that have overweighted her till she has been checked in her expansion, from the fetters that have imposed all sorts of checks upon her liberty of action. "Disestablishment and Disendowment." Do you flout those red rags in my eyes? Nay! Mere hack phrases and catchwords have no terrors for those who do not fight with shadows or windmills. It is progress that we cry for, not vulgar spoliation; and the beginning of progress in the present, and the assurance of its continuance in the future, are to be found in the processes of fearless and wise and far-sighted Reform.

THE POSITIVE NOTE IN PREACHING.

BY IAN MACLAREN.

From *The British Weekly* (London), March 25, 1897.

As this is not an audience but a conference, the speaker has not so much to read a paper as to open a discussion, and I venture to submit six propositions.

1. *That Preaching has too largely Lost the Positive Note.*—We stand aghast at the mental attitude of our fathers, who allowed no open questions, comprehending everything from the origins to the ends of time, and casting good men out for heresy on subjects about which no human being could know anything. "God could or could not do this," they used to say, and gave conclusive reasons; and beyond that point it is obvious none can travel. It is practical omniscience. We are much pleased at our attitude—who do not seem at times to have any closed questions, being willing to discuss the existence of God or the Resurrection of Christ in a neutral spirit with any person. "Even if personal immortality be a dream, still Christianity for this life

is . . ." one can go no further in religious diffidence and conciliatory concession. We congratulate ourselves on our tolerance, and we do well, provided that it arises from modesty about mysteries or charity towards our fellowmen ; but we do far from well if we are tolerant simply because we do not think there is any certainty possible in religion, or because we have no convictions to rouse our spirit. Preachers are affected by the atmosphere, and this to-day is anti-supernatural, so that, without being conscious that their faith has been weakened, they come to state truth in terms of worldly wisdom. The Personal God of the saints becomes the Eternal something or other ; He who was dead and is alive for evermore fades into the Christ Idea ; the miracles are really not to be taken as fairy tales after the suggestive discoveries of Dr. Charcot of Paris ; and immortality is saved from incredibility by the perpetually hopeful papers of the Psychological Society. One fears that in some quarters the pulpit has lost nerve. It may be that our fathers were too sure about everything ; it would be an immense gain if some of us were absolutely sure about anything.

II. *That a preacher ought to be positive*, and if he is not that he has fallen short of his vocation. It is within his function to instruct and to defend, but he is chiefly a prophet with a message to the world from God. He is a witness to the supremacy of the soul, the reality of the unseen, the glory of the kingdom of God—affirming with unflinching voice those things which all men wish to believe and do hold dimly in their minds. For the preacher the first qualification is not that he be learned or eloquent, but that he believe ; and whatever be the case with other men he must believe absolutely, thoroughly, constantly, with the marrow of his bones. If this be for him impossible, then let him be—anything he pleases, but not a preacher ; and if doubts come on him, let him face, fight, master them in secret—in the wilderness with God—and stand before men with unclouded face. There are enough men to ventilate doubt without the preacher's assistance. From

him the world expects faith most wistfully, and the direct dynamic of one man believing with all his mind and heart is incalculable. It is a reservoir of life in the midst of a bloodless and worn-out society. Doubt can be got everywhere ; faith ought to be supplied by the pulpit.

III. *That the preacher ought to be positive about the right things*, and be careful to distinguish between the facts and theories of Christianity. Our faith lives and moves and has its being amid certain facts in the sphere of religion : such as Revelation—that God has spoken to us in the Evangel ; the Deity of Christ—that Christ is the Son of the Father in a sense which can be asserted of no other man ; Redemption—that Christ by His sacrifice does deliver the human soul from the power of sin ; the Holy Ghost—that God ministers grace to the soul by His indwelling Spirit ; the life to come—that there will be another life with moral distinctions. They are facts because, as I submit, they can be verified in the experience or by the instincts of the soul. Round these facts gather a certain number of theories which are not experimental but theoretical, such as Inspiration, the Kenosis, Substitution, the sphere of the human will, eternal punishment. The facts are religion, the theories are theology, and while it may be difficult to decide the frontiers, the distinction is valid and practical. The facts should be declared in faith with much assurance, the theories should be advanced as contributing light with diffidence. It is one thing to insist on the message of God rising out of Holy Scripture from Genesis to Revelation—its very flower and fruit—and another to explain how it was given ; to present Christ as Divine, and another to speculate as to His human ignorance ; to preach Him as Saviour, and another to settle whether He offered an exact equivalent for our penalty ; to believe that whatsoever of good in us is of God, and another to distinguish between special grace given to a few, and general afforded to all ; to be quite sure that sin will be punished till it cease, and another to assert that it never will be ended, and so punishment with sin

will perpetually defy the Divine Love. When one is positive on the radiant and lovely facts of our Christian Faith, he has a strong ground ; when he is dogmatic on the results of theological science, he is at a disadvantage. For instance, if any should insist upon the inherent virtue of Christ's sacrifice to redeem the soul from the grip of sin and the sense of guilt, he is resting on a solid ground both of history and experience. When he explains the principle of the atonement, he has entered on a region of most useful and edifying speculation. He is now showing the picture with the help of a candle in order to bring out its excellence or illuminate its shadows. It has happened that a candle, after serving for a while, has burned out, and another has been put in its place, and then it in turn has been replaced, but each candle was of value. Each theory, from that of the Fathers according to which Christ paid a price to the Devil and ransomed His people, to the modern Evangelical one called the substitutionary, is a suggestion and a contribution to the better understanding of the fact. No theory is to be despised as quite impossible or barbarous—put sin for Devil in the Patristic theory, and one appreciates at once the ethical intention ; all theories are to be used to throw light on different parts of our picture, and so, in this way of it, actually become windows to be opened on different sides that one of the central doctrines of the Catholic Faith may be seen in its harmonious perfection. With this distinction Theology becomes the handmaid and not the rival of Truth.

IV. *That a preacher ought to be positive in the right spirit.* When a preacher offers the beautiful verities of Christ and His salvation as the hereditary treasure of our race, then is the soul captivated and made eager for their acceptance. What it has long been seeking for, as in a mist, has now been revealed ; what it has bitterly cried out for, as in a dry and thirsty land, is now within reach. When a preacher gathers together the various elements of the Christian Faith, and demands that one should accept them all and at once

with an alternative of punishment, then the kindly Evangel is held as a pistol to the head, and imperfectly sanctified human nature is apt to rebel. The Gospel is never negative—an embodied threat—"Refuse if you dare"; the Gospel is ever positive—a living promise, "Come and be blessed." Preaching which attacks a man's beliefs and rates a man's faults irritates and embitters; preaching which transforms a man's beliefs and replaces his faults conciliates and persuades. Is he an Agnostic?—assume that he longs to know the nameless God and drop the veil from the face of Christ. Has he a besetting sin?—exhibit to him that opposite virtue in Christ, whose Purity, like a fire, burns up our dross. If he be a slave of this present world, let the excellent glory of the eternal cast into the shade the glitter of the temporal. Let the preacher be ever full of charity, believing that every man is willing to exchange his error, which is a half truth, for the whole truth, and that every man in his best moments passionately desires to be free from his sin. Preaching should never be destruction; it ought ever to be fulfilment—the shining of light into a dark room, the rushing of a tide up the empty channel of a river, against which there is no resistance, with which comes exceeding joy.

V. *That the vast majority of Christian people hold the same verities.* There is a vague feeling that positive preaching is inexpedient or even impossible, on account of the supposed differences of opinion in every audience, and the endless controversies in the religious world. As a matter of fact, an average audience has an area of common belief twenty times larger than its area of debatable ground. With the exception of a handful of Unitarians, all Christians—Roman, Anglican, Scots, and Nonconforming—hold the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Revelation of the Will of God in Holy Scripture, the Salvation of the World by the Sacrifice of Christ, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, the Forgiveness of Sins, the Judgment of the World by Christ, and the Life Everlasting. Within this large and fruitful province

the preacher carries with him the convictions of his hearers, and has ample room for strong, clear, unwavering speech.

Whatever may be the preacher's desire, he cannot of course shut his eyes to the division which separates the Trinitarian from the Unitarian, because it goes down to the roots of things. As one may believe either that Jesus is in the Nicene sense God, or in the highest sense only man, his theology, his religion, his philosophy of the universe will take their form and spirit. While any candid person will cheerfully acknowledge the immense service rendered to true religion by Channing and Dr. Martineau, it is evident that Unitarianism has done its work, and has no promise of life. Its strength did not lie in the denial of our Lord's Deity—no religious body can stand on a negation—but in its affirmation of God's Fatherhood. This Gospel is now the common property of the Christian Church, and there remains for Unitarians, as a distinctive creed, only the denial of that truth which gives strength and joy and victorious force to Catholic Christianity. It is impossible for the preacher to speak unkindly of those who have kept the Master's commandments so perfectly, but it is also impossible for him to make any concessions to their negation, as the Deity of Christ is the very heart of our Faith.

Beyond the wide frontiers of our common faith there also lies a province where war has raged for long centuries between Christian folk. The subject of dispute has not been the work of the Lord, but the constitution of His Church, which embraces the functions of the ministry and the nature of the Sacraments. One must be very hopeful to anticipate early agreement in this sphere, and one can only note with thankfulness that all Christians hold the existence and authority of the Holy Ministry, and that two Sacraments at least are a means of grace. With so much agreement, we must possess our souls in patience, and wait for a new baptism of the Holy Ghost.

VI. *That the preacher has good grounds for being positive, and ought to have them in his mind before he*

faces his fellowmen from the Christian pulpit. For one thing, he gives an undeniable pledge of authority in standing behind the open Bible, and, as we are all much affected by signs, it is good that the preacher should give out his text from the Holy Scriptures with solemnity, and throughout his discourse reinforce himself with the words of Apostles and Prophets, and most of all the teaching of the Lord Himself. Beyond all question and by the consent of all men, the Bible has a voice of peculiar and irresistible majesty. Like the deep mellow sound of a bell floating out from a cathedral tower on the violet sky of Italy, and arresting for a brief moment at least the confused babel of the carnival below, so does the bell note of this Book fall on the restless questions and fretful anxieties of the soul. Hearers are of a sudden hushed into reverence and are graciously inclined to submission, not by the *ipse dixit* of a fallible preacher, but because the mouth of the Lord has spoken it.

What he says has also, as we take for granted, been, for the most part, verified in his own experience, and he is therefore certain will be verified in the experience of his hearers, since there is a likeness common to all souls. If he describes and analyses any particular sin which is devastating or hindering his own life, he may be certain that so many of his people will tremble because he has gone through the secret ways of their heart as with the candle of the Lord. If he commends the Divine Grace which in his sore straits has delivered or comforted him, he may give his imagination full scope, and his words will not be denied, but this man and that will desire to rise in his place and declare that the same Lord has done yet greater things for him. We speak from life to life, from conscience to conscience, from heart to heart, with unerring correspondence.

And the preacher of the Evangel does not stand alone before his audience, for this single puny figure is flung into relief against the background of the saints of all ages—the Catholic Church of God. They also have grasped the promises and trusted in God; they

also have made their venture, and have not been put to confusion. Christ afar off or near has been to them all their desire and their salvation. When the preacher makes his appeal for Christ, he wakens an echo from distant places and many centuries. Abraham, going forth into a strange country, on the strength of the promise, cries Amen; Isaiah, writing his fifty-third chapter, joins in the word; St. John lifts his head from Jesus' bosom to add his testimony; St. Paul raises his chained arm to bear witness to the Lord. Unto the vision of Faith the heavens are opened, and there is seen a multitude no man can number who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb, and unto the ear of Faith the preacher's voice is drowned in music like unto the sound of many waters—"Blessing and honour and glory and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever."

THE HISTORY OF METHODISM.

BY REV. JAMES M. WHITON.

From *The Outlook* (New York), April 17, 1897.

DR. BUCKLEY's work on this subject will here serve rather for a text than for a critical review. His name is warrant for its worth. It has the merits, with the inevitable defects, of a rigorously compressed exhibition of a subject embarrassing by its very wealth. For such defects he has made up as far as possible by a copious bibliography. He has spared no pains in the verification of particulars hitherto undetermined or inaccurately stated. Over one hundred illustrations, mostly portraits, make his pages a gallery of the worthies of the Church.¹

The reader may be prompted to reflect: What

¹ *A History of Methodism in the United States.* By James M. Buckley. In Two Volumes. Illustrated. The Christian Literature Company, New York. \$5.

would the English-speaking peoples have been, what would our Republic have been, but for that fresh tide of religious life which rose in the hearts of the Wesleys and their praying circle at Oxford, where they were nicknamed "Methodists" in 1735?—a tide whose rise and spread now shows five million communicants of that name in the United States alone, and twenty-four million people throughout the world under Methodist teaching. It is certain that that tide did more than anything else to lift England out of the mud of heathenism in which the receding tide of defeated Puritanism had left it. It is certain that it, more than anything else, averted the spread of heathenism through the American communities, which began to extend southward and westward after the Revolutionary War.

"There was," says Green, in his "History of the English People," "a revolt against religion and against churches in both the extremes of English society." "The poor were incredibly ignorant and brutal; the rich and noble were incredibly debauched and heartless; the clergy were incredibly remiss and lifeless. The Church, Christian in name, was pagan in fact. In that arctic midnight of religion a sympathetic revolt from its general degradation drew together that little group of Oxford students for study of the New Testament, and prayer, and benevolent work among the poor, and the orderly regulation of their own life—from which last derision affixed to them the name of "Methodists." Four years later, in 1739, a "United Society"—in a sense the first Methodist church—was formed in Bristol, and by 1744 John Wesley was the virtual bishop of twenty-three itinerant and several local preachers. Thus unexpectedly and rapidly was the flood-tide beginning to set in. The voice of the revivalists, says Green, had been heard "in the widest and most barbarous corners of the land, among the bleak moors of Northumberland, or in the dens of London, or in the long galleries where, in the pauses of his labor, the Cornish miner listens to the sobbing

¹ See also Lecky's description of English life and manners in his "History of the Eighteenth Century," in Volumes I. and IV.

of the sea." "To the poor," said Jesus, "the Gospel is preached:" for this the primitive Puritan labored; for this the present-day Salvationist labors; this has ever been the aim of the Methodist.

As Dr. John Fiske observes, it is the prolonged infancy of man in dependence upon parental nurture which necessitates the permanence of the family union, and thereby gives rise to social communities and human progress in general. To a similar cause the orderly progress and development of Methodism is due. Louis XIV.'s famous saying, "I am the State," is not far from being applicable to Wesley, however he would have revolted from saying, "I am the Church." But unquestionably the prolongation of his life as both the apostle and lawgiver of his Church throughout the whole of its adolescent and formative period, during which it was plastic to his organizing and guiding hand, secured to it both its stable basis and its symmetrical development. As a preacher second only to that incomparable Whitefield whom a skeptic like Hume said he would go twenty miles to hear; as a hymnist second only to his peerless brother Charles, who has given six hundred and twenty-seven hymns to the Methodist Hymn-Book, he was pre-eminent in fitness for patriarchal administration and government. No man has come so near the position of a Protestant pope. In Great Britain his sole judgment sufficed to exclude any member or minister deemed unworthy. In America, in 1770, the deed of the old John Street Church, the first Methodist church in America, restricted its use to such persons only as Wesley should appoint. This autocratic constitution was but a natural incident of the period of tutelage, through which scattered societies mainly composed of the humbler sort of people, with their visible bond chiefly in the person of their beloved founder and father, grew at length into a fully organized Church in the form of a presbyterian episcopacy.

If there is any body of Christians which can be charged with sectarianism, it is not the Methodists. It is not their fault that they are not included in the Epis-

copal communion. In 1792 a proposition for such a union, initiated by a Methodist, Dr. Coke, was thrown out by the House of Deputies, though agreed to by the House of Bishops. John Wesley sincerely strove to be a good Anglican churchman. Excluded from the parish churches, he was driven, against his prejudices, to field meetings, to the building of chapels, the employment of lay preachers, and, finally, in 1784, upon the refusal of the Bishop of London, to ordain ministers for his scattered societies in America, with a view to organize them into an episcopally constituted Church. In 1799 a plan of Coke's for securing a virtual union of British Wesleyans with the Anglican Church was discouraged by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In both countries Methodists were compelled to stand by themselves.

A propitious conjunction of need and supply was marked by the synchronism of the close of the Revolutionary War in 1783, and the organization of the Methodist Church in America in 1784. This was virtually the inauguration of a national home missionary society, to keep pace with the advance of the rude pioneers of civilization into the wilds of the South and West. There the enthusiastic scenes and the rapid ingatherings which, a half-century before, had rewarded the field-preaching of Wesley and Whitefield in Britain, were repeated. Methodism has been spoken of as having some claim to be called the national church of America. Its evangelizing energy made it eminently the church of the common people in large sections of the country. The directing mind of its advance, until he died in 1816, was Francis Asbury, a man remarkable for his missionary activity, his self-restraint, his unerring discrimination, and deservedly ranked by Methodists with Wesley, Whitefield, and Coke. Among his subordinates were such men as Jesse Lee, the "father of New England Methodism;" Peter Cartwright, noted for a rugged service of seventy years; and a goodly fellowship of other strong and fiery souls, fervid preachers, princely senators of the Church.

To speak of the later history of Methodism, its development of representative government, its democratization, its educational and missionary enterprise, would lead afield from the present purpose, for which the foregoing sketch suffices. The essential character and aim of Methodism were given to it in its formative period, and it is with these that we are now concerned.

The great truth of which Wesley was the prophet is the immediate presence and power of the Holy Spirit in the normally Christian life. By the usual tests he had been an exemplary Christian for years prior to 1738, at which he dated the beginning of his regenerated life. This, however, was not a new life, but a new stage of Christian experience—its full manhood as distinct from its childhood and adolescence. Its distinguishing mark was the inward voice of the Spirit, witnessing to the full acceptance of a full surrender of self to God, with full assurance of the love of God and oneness with his holy will for a holy life. In an age which scarcely knew God but as a name in sacred liturgies and profane swearing, this living consciousness of the living God as the Soul of the soul was the torch that rekindled the dead altar-fires wherever the torchbearer ran. The characteristic and essential message of Methodism has been, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit." However its first reception among the rude and sensuous may have been attended with psychical rather than spiritual effects, it has tended to work clear of these into spiritual power, as out of the ecstasies of the earlier shrieking prophets emerged the diviner utterances of a Hosea and an Isaiah. It has been said that the fault most common in Christians is that they do not believe fully in the Holy Spirit. The Wesleyan gospel is pre-eminently a gospel of the Spirit. Its main emphasis is on regeneration, sanctification, and the full assurance of hope through surrender to the Spirit.

Enough is known of Wesley's aversion to Calvinism. Not enough is known of his essential Lutheranism, in emphasizing devout feeling as the predominant characteristic of the religious consciousness. In this would

that all were Lutherans and Methodists ! But an unbalanced, sometimes unethical, emotionalism has been laid, not wholly without cause, to the charge of Methodists. As to this, it may be said that a system, or a constructive idea, is not to be judged by the aberrations from which it suffers, but by its normal operation. It may also be asked :

What keeps a spirit wholly true
To that ideal which he bears ?
What record ? Not the sinless years
That breathed beneath the Syrian blue.

One need not ask, also, whether religion is more in danger from emotionalism than from dogmatism. The ethico-spiritual character of Methodism is demonstrable. Wesley thought that the "grand deposit" of truth committed to Methodists to propagate was the ethical proposition that a man is capable of that completeness of voluntary obedience to God which may, notwithstanding his involuntary transgressions in weakness and ignorance, be relatively described as Christian perfection. Upon his disciples he impressed from the first a distinctively ethical aim in the "rules" drawn up for their societies. These rules forbid swearing, Sabbath-breaking, intoxicating drinks, quarreling, lawing, smuggling, usury, evil speaking, dishonest borrowing, etc., with a particularity lately well imitated by General Booth's regulations for his Army.

The ethical spirit of early Puritanism thus passed on into Methodism, together also with its ascetic spirit, traces of which still, perhaps unduly, tinge its "discipline." Stronger, however, than their ascetic spirit, as well as ethically superior, was the philanthropic character of Wesley's rules, in their specific injunctions to the doing of all possible good. To Methodism must be ascribed the initial impulse to that forward movement of philanthropic reforms which set in toward the close of the last century. Robert Raikes is celebrated as the founder of Sunday-schools. But it was a Methodist woman who gave him the counsel on which he acted. In 1844 the Methodist Church in the United States performed an act impossible for any

ecclesiastical body in which the ethical interest is not supreme, by a peaceable division of itself into two churches—North and South—upon a case of conscience touching the rightfulness of holding slaves upon any ground, however plausible.

The remarkable spread of Methodism, with the aim of reproducing that life in the Spirit of holiness which was characteristic of the youth of Christianity, is due not only to its rediscovery of the source of power in the truths of the Spirit, but also to its wise and free opening of new and needful channels of spiritual power. Never before had the power of spiritual songs been so effectively applied as in Charles Wesley's hymnody, sixty-six hundred of whose lyrics are extant in print or manuscript. Never had the principle of co-operative association been so thoroughly applied as in Wesley's class meetings by twelves. A vast amount of energy hitherto unemployed was brought into permanent activity by his institution of lay preachers. The power of Christian fellowship was augmented by the institution of prayer-meetings—for which the date of 1762 has been assigned. The movement was further strengthened by the co-operation of women, who now for the first time became a slowly but steadily increasing element of power. The women of Methodism are among its chief glories. Witness John Wesley's incomparable mother, Susannah, who incited him to the decisive innovation of appointing lay preachers; Selina, Countess of Huntingdon, the patroness of Whitefield's Calvinistic branch of Methodists, spending a hundred thousand pounds in its establishment; Barbara Heck, the virtual founder of American Methodism; and others scarcely less noteworthy in the past or known in the present. It was Whitefield's preaching which, when the "Great Awakening" of 1735 in New England had spent its force, revived it, and extended it to the churches of the Middle Provinces.

But there is cause to regard this stock itself, if not a slip from the soil of Congregational New England, as drawing its first nourishment therefrom. Wesley's belief in the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit

within the soul was Edwards's belief still earlier. From that belief proceeded the great awakening under Edwards's preaching. Wesley, says Miss Wedgwood,¹ read Edwards's account of it in 1738—that year of his spiritual crisis above referred to—and wrote thereon in his Journal, "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes." Revivalism, as well as the ethical spirit, passed on from Puritanism to Methodism, a contribution requited, indeed, by an abundant return.

The whole Church confesses her debt to Wesley, whom Dr. Schaff has called "the most apostolic man since the apostolic age." Wesley himself confesses his debt to the humble Moravian, Peter Bohler, who first opened his eyes to the gift of God in the Spirit. From the confluence of the evangelical warmth of the one with the practical energy and directing wisdom of the other has proceeded the history of Methodism in the line given by the apostolic counsels: "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee;" "Provoke unto love and good works."

HOW I BECAME POPE.

BY PIUS THE SECOND.

Extracted from the Pope's Autobiographical Commentaries.

(Translated by Alfred N. Macfayden.)

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), April, 1897.

"WHEN the news of the Pope's death reached Philip, the Cardinal Bishop of Bologna, in his retreat at Bagnorea from the heat of the summer, he made his way to Viterbo, and set out with Aeneas toward Rome for the election of a successor. As they went along together they found the whole Court, and more than half the populace, running to meet them outside the

¹ Quoted in Professor A. V. G. Allen's "Jonathan Edwards," page 134.

walls. 'One of you two,' shouted every voice, 'will be elected Pope.'

So begins the only account of that great recurring drama of the ages of Faith, the election of a new Pope, by one who has been plunged into that whirlpool of intrigue and come out victorious on the other side. Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, who assumed the name of Pius the Second, was a born journalist. He was the Andrew Lang of the Vatican. Society verses, novelettes, histories, travels slipped with equal ease from his graceful pen. He was an orator and a statesman, with but one besetting sin—he could as soon have neglected good "copy" as have written bad Latin. And so in the "Commentaries" which he produced at his leisure in imitation of the great Julius, and which have never yet been done into English, he gives us a wonderfully vivid, somewhat lurid, glimpse into the Vatican in the period just after the anti-Popes, when it lay under the influence of a few great Italian families—Colonna, Piccolomini, Orsini, Borgia.

Pius the Second succeeded a Borgia, Calixtus the Third, on the 19th of August, 1458. His principal rivals were William d'Estouteville, Archbishop of Rouen, and Philippe Calendrino, a brother of Nicholas the Fifth, the last Pope but one. The Vice-Chancellor, who takes a prominent part in the story, was the infamous Roderic Lenzoli Borgia, who assumed the name of Alexander the Sixth; and Pietro Barbo, the Cardinal-priest of St. Mark at Venice, was our historian's successor, under the style of Paul the Second. With this introduction to the principal actors, we can leave Aeneas to tell his own tale, with the one reminder that, like his great exemplar, he speaks of himself in the third person.

"The other eighteen Cardinals joined the Conclave on the tenth day after Calixtus' death. The whole State hung upon the issue, though the popular expectation conferred the Pontificate upon Aeneas, Bishop of Siena, and none stood higher in reputation."

The number is important. A candidate must secure a two-thirds majority plus one. In this case he re-

quired twelve votes. If he obtained these, he had the privilege of voting for himself and so deciding the matter. Aeneas, though he does not mention it, made use of this privilege.

"The Conclave was erected in the hall of the Apostles at St. Peter's, two courts and two chapels being included. They built cells for the Cardinals to eat and sleep in, in the larger chapel. The smaller, called the Chapel of St. Nicholas, was allotted to consultation and the election of the Pope. The courtyards were for general use as a promenade.

"On the day of assembly no progress was made with the election. The following day various rules were promulgated, which the Cardinals laid down to be observed by the new Head, and each man swore that he would observe these if the choice should fall upon him. On the third day Mass was celebrated, and we proceeded to the scrutiny. It was found that Philip, Bishop of Bologna, and Aeneas, Bishop of Siena, had been proposed for the Pontificate by an equal number of voices, each receiving five nominations; of the others no one received more than three.

"No one at that stage, whether this was a trick, or the result of his unpopularity, selected William of Rouen. The scrutiny completed and the result announced, the Cardinals came together and sat in council. The question then put to us was, 'Is there any one who will change his mind, and transfer his vote to another candidate?' This method of election is called 'Election by Accession.' It is easier to arrive at agreement by this plan, a process objected to at the first scrutiny by those who had not received any votes at all, because no 'accession' could be made to their party.

"We adjourned to luncheon, and from that moment what cabals! The more powerful members of the College, whether their strength lay in reputation or wealth, beckoned others to their side. They promised, they threatened. There were even some who without a blush, without a shred of modesty, pleaded their own merits, and demanded the supreme Pontifi-

cate for themselves. . . . Each man boasted of his qualifications. The bickering of these claimants was something extraordinary ; through a day and a sleepless night it raged with unabated virulence. William of Rouen was not so apprehensive of these brawlers as of Aeneas and the Bolognese Cardinal, towards whom he saw that most of the voters inclined ; but he was especially anxious about Aeneas, whose silence, he did not doubt, carried more weight than the yelping of others. He called to himself now this clique, now that, and assailed them with, ' What is there between you and Aeneas that makes you think him worthy of the Papal dignity ? Are you going to make a man our Chief Priest who does his work on foot and has not a penny ? How is a poor man to relieve the poverty of the Church ; an invalid to heal the sick ? It was only the other day he came from Germany. We know nothing of him. He may even carry the Court away with him back to Germany. What does his literary culture matter ? Are we to place a society versifier on the throne of St. Peter ? Think you "good form" will govern the Church ? Or do you think Philip of Bologna the better man ? He is a stiff-necked fellow, who will neither be clever enough to steer himself nor listen to those who warn him of the proper course ! I am the senior Cardinal ; you know me to be cautious ; I am a past master in Papal learning ; of royal descent ; a man with a large following and large property, with which I can assist our needy Church ; I have no small number of benefices at my disposal, which I shall distribute and confer upon you and others.'

" To his promises he added a host of entreaties ; if these had not the desired effect, threats ; when any one objected that his simony was an obstacle, that his Papacy would be a venal one, he would make no denial that his past life had been besmirched with the mire of simony, but for the future—for the future, he asserted, his hands should be clean ! Cardinal Alano of Rimini—an insolent and venal creature—was his second, and backed his candidature by every possible manœuvre.

It was not so much that he, as a Frenchman, was the partisan of a Frenchman, as that he expected Rouen Cathedral, with William's house in the city and his chancellorship, if he should be promoted. Many were entangled by his huge bribes. They were entrapped by the fellow like flies. Christ's tunic, in Christ's absence, was up for sale !

"Several Cardinals met in the latrines, and, with that as their retreat, they plotted with the greater secrecy how they should make William Pope. They bound themselves by written agreements and oaths ; and he, relying upon these, promised dignities and positions, and allotted provinces, in virtue of his prerogative. An appropriate place to choose such a Pope ! Where find a better spot to enter upon foul conspiracies than in the latrines? . . .

"The Cardinals on William's side made no small party, eight in number. The Bishop of Bologna, Orsini, and the Cardinal-priest of St. Anastasia were wavering. A touch would send them over ; they actually had given ground for some hope ; and since eleven appeared to be in unison, there was no fear of failing to find a twelfth without delay. For when a candidate reaches that stage, why ! there is ever some one at his elbow who says, ' I too vote to make you Pope,' so as to gain his goodwill. So they began to think the whole business was finished, and they merely waited for dawn to proceed to the scrutiny. Midnight had already slipped past when who but the Bolognese made his way to Aeneas and roused him from his slumbers. 'Come, come, Aeneas,' he exclaimed, 'know you not that we already have a Pope? A number of Cardinals have met in the latrines ; they have determined to appoint William ; they await nothing but daylight. My advice is this : get out of bed, go to him and add your voice to his side ; lest if you oppose him and he become Pontiff, he bear a grudge against you. I shall look after my own skin, and avoid the snare I fell into before. I know what it is to have a Pope for my enemy. I have had that experience with Calixtus, who never gave me a friendly glance

because I did not vote for him. My opinion is that it is politic to anticipate the favour of the man who is to be Pope. I am giving to you the advice on which I am myself acting.

“ ‘Philip,’ replied Aeneas, ‘no man shall ever persuade me to adopt your base subterfuge ; to think of choosing one I deem an unworthy varlet as successor of the blessed Peter ! Far from me be this crime ! If others choose him, that is their affair. I will be clear of this transgression ; my conscience shall not assail me. You say it is a hard lot to have an ill-affected Pope ; I have no dread of that. I know he will not murder me for not voting for him. If he love me not, he will merely give me no revenue, and no patronage.’

“ ‘You will feel the pinch of poverty.’

“ ‘Poverty is no hardship to a man who is accustomed to be poor. I have led a life of indigence up to this day—what is it to me if I die a pauper ? He robs me not of the Muses, who are ever the more gracious when one’s purse is light. Nay, I am not the man to believe that God will suffer his Bride, the Church, to languish utterly in the hands of William of Rouen. What is more contrary to the Christian profession than that Christ’s Vicar should be a slave to simony and licentiousness ? God’s righteousness will not allow this palace, wherein so many holy Fathers have dwelt, to be a den of robbers or a stew of harlots. The Apostleship is derived from God and not from men. Who knows not that the thoughts of the fellows who have banded together to gain the Pontificate for William are set on vanity ? How fit that their conspiracy was hatched in the latrines ! Their intrigues will end in a secession ; and, like the Arian heresy, the foul instruments will meet their end in some place of abomination. To-morrow will show that the Bishop of Rome is chosen by God and not by men. If you are a follower of Christ, you will refuse to take as Christ’s Vicar one whom you know to be a limb of the Devil.’

“ These arguments scared Philip from his support of William ; and at the first peep of dawn Aeneas ap-

proached Roderic, the Vice-Chancellor, with the blunt inquiry, 'Have you sold yourself to William?'

'What would you have me do?' he retorted. 'The first act is over. Quite a number met in the latrines, and determined to choose this fellow. It would be foolish for me to linger with the minority outside the Pontiff's favour. I run with the larger crowd; I have done the best for myself. I shall not lose my Chancellorship. I have his promise in black and white; if I do not vote for William others will do so, and I shall lose my office!'

"Greenhorn!" interrupted Aeneas, 'so you are going to set in the Apostle's chair an enemy of your nation, and will honour the pledge of one who knows no honour. You will indeed have your pledge; but the Archbishop of Avignon will have your Chancellorship. The very bribe that is promised you is not only promised but assured to him. Will the fellow keep faith with you or with him? Why, with the Frenchman, not the Catalanian! The Frenchman will win. Will he oblige a foreigner or a compatriot? Beware, young simpleton! Have a care, good Muddle-pate! Though the Church of Rome be nothing to you, though you hold Christ's religion as cheap as you hold God contemptible, for whom are you elevating such a Vicar? Give a thought at least to your own position. With a French Pope you will be in most sorry case.'

'The Vice-Chancellor listened to his friend's harangue attentively, and gave him a qualified adherence.

"Next to the Pavian Cardinal. 'Am I rightly informed that you too,' queried Aeneas, 'are of one mind with those who have resolved to elect William? Is that so?'

"Certainly; I have promised to give him my vote, that I may not be left in a minority of one. Believe me, it's a foregone conclusion; the fellow has such a string of backers!'

"I find you are not the man I took you for," Aeneas continued. "... Have we not often heard you say that the Church would perish if it fell into William's

hands—"death before submission"? Why this right-about? Has he been transfigured in a trice from Apollyon to an angel, or you from angel to devil, that you fall in love with his lusts, obscenities, and avarice? Where have you cast your patriotism and your usual exaltation of Italy above all other lands? I used to think that when every one else was false to his love of her you would never flinch. You have deceived me, or rather your own self and your Italian motherland, if you come not back to your senses!

"The Bishop of Pavia was nonplussed by these reproaches. Remorse and shame surged up within him; he burst into a flood of tears. Then, after some deep-drawn sighs, he moaned, 'I am ashamed of myself, but what am I to do? I have passed my word. If I do not vote for William I shall stand guilty of treachery.'

"So far as I can discern,' the other retorted, 'it has come to this, that whichever path you take you are travelling toward the name of traitor. Now you must make your choice. Had you rather give up Italy, your country, and your Church, or William of Rouen?' The Pavian yielded to this taunt; a lighter stigma appeared to lie upon his desertion of William.

"Pietro Barbo, the Cardinal of St. Mark, so soon as he had news of the French cabals, and had no longer any hope of securing the Pontificate for himself, was roused at once by patriotism and his very hearty hatred of the Archbishop of Rouen to canvass the Italian Cardinals. He implored and entreated them not to play the traitor. His feet knew no rest until he had gathered the whole of the Italians, except Colonna, outside the Bishop of Genoa's cell. He explained to them the conspiracy of the latrines. 'The Church will perish,' he cried, 'and Italy be ever more in bondage, if this man from Rouen lays hands upon the Pontificate. Would that each and all of you would bear yourselves like men! Be loyal to Mother Church, and to your mother country in her distress. Put on one side any personal jealousies you may bear each other. Choose an Italian, not an alien Pope. Let each who hears me put Aeneas in the forefront.'

"There were present seven in all, and there was only one dissentient from their unanimous approval, Aeneas himself, who thought himself unequal to that tremendous responsibility. Eventually we adjourned to Mass, and as soon as the last word was intoned set ourselves to the scrutiny. A golden casket was placed upon the High Altar and three watchmen—the Cardinal Bishop of Rodez, the Cardinal Archbishop of Rouen, the Cardinal Deacon Colonna—kept their eyes upon it, that no chicanery should interrupt the ballot. The rest of the Cardinals sat each at their own place; then they rose in the order of precedence and seniority, stepped up to the altar, and dropped into the casket a ballot paper on which they had written the name of their nominee.

"As Aeneas stepped forward to drop his paper into the casket, William thrust his hand away, every nerve a-tremble. 'Remember, Aeneas,' he gasped, 'how frequently you have been advertised of my merits.' It was a rash appeal at that juncture, when a change in the written vote would have been irregular; but his eagerness mastered his self-restraint. 'Yes,' rejoined Aeneas, 'but are you really reduced to self-advertisement with such a worm as your humble servant?' Without another word he dropped his paper into the casket and slipped back into his seat.

"When all the others had followed his example, the table was set in the middle of a court; and the three Cardinals mentioned above emptied the casketful of ballot papers upon it. Each vote was read out separately in a distinct voice, and the scrutators jotted down the names they found inscribed. Every one of the Cardinals made a similar list, to avoid the bare possibility of deception. This custom stood Aeneas in good stead; for, after the tally was complete, the Rouen tally-man announced that Aeneas had received eight votes. No one said a word about a deduction that only affected Aeneas and not themselves. But Aeneas would not let himself be imposed upon. He shouted out to the speaker, 'Look better to your papers. I am the nominee of nine voters.' Every one

cried 'Aye,' and the Archbishop subsided with the air of having committed some trifling inaccuracy. The formula of the nomination, which each voter wrote out with his own hand, was as follows: 'I—Peter, or John, or whatever his name might be—do hereby select to be Pope of Rome, Aeneas, Cardinal Bishop of Siena, and James, Bishop of Lisbon.' It is quite in order to vote for one, two, or even several names, with the proviso understood that the names take precedence in the order of their mention. If one candidate has not enough votes, the next on the list takes his place, so as to facilitate a general agreement. But many cleverly devised systems are turned to fraudulent purposes. One example was given at that ballot by Latinus Orsini, who put seven names on his list, with the object of flattering the seven by his complaisance into either making "accession" to himself at that scrutiny, or voting for him at some other. But in his case, as he was known to be a trickster, the stratagem seriously injured his prospects.

"When the result of the poll was declared, it was discovered, as I have mentioned before, that nine Cardinals had voted for Aeneas. . . .

"The Archbishop of Rouen had six votes, the others were on a much lower level. Every one gazed in astonishment at William when he found himself left so far behind. Within human memory no candidate had ever mounted so high as nine votes at a ballot. Since no one had the required majority it was resolved to go into council and try the method known as 'accession,' to get the Pontiff made, if possible, that day. Once more the Archbishop of Rouen nourished a deceptive hope. There sat all those prelates, each in his place—not a word, not a sound—speechless as men whose life is at the ebb. For a considerable time nobody spoke, nobody even yawned. Not a muscle stirred, only the restless eyes glanced idly hither and thither. That moment was enthralling! What a picture were those human statues! 'Twas like that moment 'twixt life and death when not a sound reaches the ear, not a movement can be seen.

"Thus they sat for an appreciable interval, the juniors waiting for the older men to begin the 'accession.' Then Vice-Chancellor Roderic leaped from his seat. 'I accede to the Cardinal Bishop of Siena.' His phrase struck home like a rapier to William's heart, with such a rush did it send the blood from the poor fellow's cheeks. Then another pause. Side glances passed from one to another as each indicated his favourite by a nod, and the general upshot of it was that they already had a vision of Aeneas in the Papal robes. As soon as this was obvious, some stalked out of the place to avoid seeing the issue of the day. . . . They made the claims of exhausted nature their excuse, but when there was a rush after them they quickly returned. Then James, Cardinal-priest of St. Anastasia: 'I add my accession to the Bishop of Siena.' At that a more complete stupefaction descended on the assembly, and every one lost the power of speech, as men might do in a house shaken by mysterious earthquakes. One voice was yet lacking from the twelve that would make Aeneas Pope. Grasping the situation, Prosper Colonna thought great would be his fame if his sole voice proclaimed the Pontiff, and, rising to his feet, made as if he would give the customary vote with becoming dignity. In the middle of his sentence the Archbishop of Nice and William of Rouen seized upon him, with bitter reproaches against his designed accession to Aeneas. When he stood by his resolve they struggled with might and main to drag him from the place; grasping him, the one by the right, the other by the left arm, they tried to drag him away and rescue the Pontificate for the latter.

"Prosper Colonna, however, though his written vote was for the Archbishop, was bound to Aeneas by a long-standing friendship, and, with 'A fig for your bombast!' turned towards the other Cardinals. 'I also give accession to the Cardinal Bishop of Siena, and so make him Pope.' As the words dropped from his lips, the spirit of opposition vanished, the whole intrigue fell to pieces, and the Cardinals, without a moment's delay, one and all prostrated themselves be-

fore Aeneas, and hailed him as Pope without a murmur of dissent. Then Cardinal Bessarion, the Archbishop of Nice, speaking for himself and the other partisans of William, remarked : ' Your Holiness, we give our heartiest approval to your elevation, which is, without doubt, the will of the Almighty. We always thought you as thoroughly worthy of this dignity as we do now. Our only reason for not voting for you was your indifferent health ; nothing but your gout appears to us to mar your perfect efficiency. We do obeisance to you as Pope ; we elect you over again, as far as we are concerned ; and we shall give you our loyal support.'

" ' You have treated our faults, dear Bishop, far more leniently than we should do,' replied Aeneas. ' You lay blame upon us for naught but an ailment of our feet, and we are aware that it is widely known that our shortcomings could scarce be numbered, and that we might have been fairly disqualified by them for the Apostolic seat. We can think of no merits that have raised us to this position. We should have confessed our utter unworthiness and refused to embrace the proffered dignity did we not respect the voice that summons us. For what two-thirds of the Sacred College have done may be taken for an act of the Holy Spirit, and it would have been sin to withstand it. We therefore obey God's behest, and honour you, dear Bishop, and those who agreed with you, if you but followed the guidance of your conscience, and disapproved of our election on the ground of our deficiencies. You shall all alike be our friends, for we owe our vocation not to this man or that man, but to the whole College, and to God Himself, from whom cometh everything that is good and every perfect gift.'

" Without any further speech Aeneas doffed his former garments and received the white tunic of Christ, and to the question, ' By what name do you elect to be known?' replied, ' Pius the Second.' . . . The valets of the Cardinals in Conclave at once rifled the new Pope's cell. The rascals made loot of all his money—not much of a prize!—and made off with his

books and his clothes. . . . Outside the evening shadows were drawing in, when bonfires flashed forth in every public square, from the top of every tower; songs burst upon the ear, neighbour hailed neighbour to festivity. North and south, east and west, echoed trumpets and bugles; every corner of the city was alive with cheering crowds. Old men used to tell that they had never in Rome seen such an outburst of popular enthusiasm."

CURRENT THOUGHT.

Christian Belief.

BEING a Christian believer does not depend upon the psychology of Jesus Christ which one adopts. One may believe that Jesus Christ is God and man mysteriously joined together, a dual personality, in some acts showing forth God, in others manifesting man. There are, in our judgment, fatal objections to this, the mediæval view of the God-man, but one may hold it and be a Christian believer. Or one may hold that Jesus Christ was simply the divine spirit in a human body, or the Second Person of the Trinity in a human body, and subject to the limitations of a fleshly organism. There are, in our judgment, fatal objections to this view of the God-man; but one may hold it and be a Christian believer. Or one may believe that Jesus of Nazareth was so filled with the Spirit of God that whatever the man Jesus thought or said or did reflected the inspiring, indwelling presence of the Eternal Spirit of love and truth. This is the simplest of the three explanations, but it wins its simplicity, it seems to us, by ignoring or denying some transcendently important statements in the Gospels and some

transcendently important facts in the history of Christianity; nevertheless, one may hold this view of Christ as a "God-filled man" and be a Christian believer. Or he may confess his inability to form any perfect psychology of Jesus Christ, and be content to see in him, and in the "human life of God" reflected in him, at once a transcendental manifestation of the invisible and eternal God and a perfect ideal of a divinely begotten and inspired humanity; and despite his refusal to formulate and phrase a perfect and complete Christology, he will be a Christian believer.—*The Outlook*, N. Y. (Udenom.).

HOWEVER insignificant may be the part we play in creation, whatever may be the riddles and mysteries of our existence, we still bear the image of God in our nature, still feel that we have a higher destiny, a life which reaches out toward the illimitable. That image cannot be so deeply impressed upon human nature, and yet fail to lift it to a higher development. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." Amid all the debasement and

ruin of man this divine stamp remains as the pledge of remedy. Religion is not narrowness, then, but breadth, the realization of the greatness of man, not of his insignificance. For this view the highest culture and the widest knowledge is a stimulus rather than a hindrance to Christian faith. The difficulties of science, instead of confusing and dismaying the mind, only serve to concentrate it more firmly upon the certainties of religion. Difficulties, as Cardinal Newman said, do not constitute doubt. The essential question is whether God has revealed himself to man; whether he has shown us how the natural man can be transformed into the spiritual man. If it can be shown that he has done so by taking upon himself our body and sharing our lot, all the difficulties raised by the culture that "puffeth itself up" are overcome. —*The Observer*, N. Y. (Pres.).

THE rapidity with which the past is made to reveal its buried treasures is one of the surprises of the last years of this century. We might well imagine that the countless scourges of war and fire, and the slow but certain waste and decay that come from the flight of the years, would by this time have put an end to all the remaining records of the thought and life of remote ages. But the very opposite is the fact. New records are brought forth from their hiding-places so frequently, and they are so important withal, that our faith is taxed to the utmost to accept either the story of the discovery or the authenticity of the records. But both are true. . . . The imagination cannot reach any safe solution of these astounding mysteries. To our thinking, the discoveries are just at the beginning. The ex-

ploring societies are multiplying. Germany, France, Great Britain, and the United States are sending out trained men in large numbers, and they are reporting new discoveries with singular rapidity. All the classic lands are depositories of treasures not yet revealed. Authors hitherto unknown are sure to find their readers for the first time since the dawn of modern civilization, while missing links in celebrated fragments, as in the books of Livy, may yet be supplied. To the Christian believer this process of making the buried past reveal its long-kept secrets brings infinite courage and hope. More and more the Bible is rising in the certainty of rich and full confirmation. Every new manuscript only adds to its authenticity. Not a chapter has fallen out by the testimony of clay tablet or papyrus roll. Let no timid Christian fear for the result. The pick and the spade of even the unchristian scholar are adding to the testimony of the sure word of God.—*The Christian Advocate*, N. Y. (M. E.).

Inspiration.

MAKE it clear that the earliest of the Gospels did not take its present form until a full century after the ascension of Christ, and you have secured ample space for the operation of all kinds of vagaries and myth-makings. Thousands of Christian believers, who, like ourselves, do not believe that the New Testament could have been evolved from intellectual tendencies or myth-making propensities in five times a hundred years, nevertheless have felt that, if it could be proved that a gap of a century intervenes between the events and the writings, the New Testament lacks a first-hand authority which it is in vain to at-

tempt to impart to it, *tout de force*, by a high theory of inspiration. We do not doubt that God could have inspired men to describe events that took place a century before they were born, but such a theory of inspiration we all feel would be prompted by a desire to secure the authority of the writings. From this point of view, it is a matter for intense satisfaction when we find that a scientific critic, like Harnack, whose competency is thoroughly admitted by the most revolutionary theorists, and who has no prejudices in favor of the traditional view, gives it as his deliberate conviction that the evidence does not allow us to separate the New Testament writings from the apostolic age.—*The Watchman*, Boston (Bap.).

Church Service.

We are happy to have heard of the organization in the Presbyterian Church of a society to be known as the Church Service Society. This movement has made considerable progress in Scotland, and there was good need that it should. Within the past fifty years, it is simply a fact that the doctrinal confession of the Westminster Assembly has lost its former hold upon the heart and mind of Presbyterians everywhere. . . . We are glad to see that they are doing so distinctly "upon the basis of that doctrine of the Church, the ministry, and the sacraments, which is set forth in the Westminster standards." If they were actuated by a spirit of schismatic discontent they would fail, and they would deserve to fail. Being loyal men, as they are, they deserve to succeed; but if they do, they will build more largely than they now know or perhaps intend. The

growth of the idea of worship among them will make other things appear less important than they have done in the past. Of all imaginable things worship is the least favorable to controversial scholasticism. It expresses only that which is spiritual, and whatever is truly spiritual is truly catholic. Thus, as the years go on, faith will grow larger and opinion less large in their relative importance; the sense of unity with those who hold the same faith will grow stronger than the sense of division from those who differ from them in opinion; and at last, it may be hoped, they will contribute largely to that catholic unity of the spirit which is so painfully marred by our modern system of denominational sectarianism.—*Church Standard*, Phila. (P. E.)

THAT some pastors observe that certain of their young people stray off to the Episcopal fold because "they like the service" is not necessarily an argument in favor of reproducing a diluted form of Episcopal liturgy for general use. As a matter of fact, some people are better helped spiritually by set forms of petitional address, where they know beforehand everything that is coming, while others are much more edified by exercises accentuated to the needs of the hour, where spontaneity and freshness characterize the self-unfolding prayers. An "extemporaneous" prayer is not necessarily uncouth and rude, while on the other hand some very undignified expressions occur in popular liturgies. The true test, after all, is a spiritual and not a literary, much less a fashionable, one. The real question is, What form of prayer is spiritually most helpful to the greatest number? If the form most

assisting edification be a liturgy, then nothing need be said against liturgical services, despite all the perversions of a popery and a ritualism which have misused them in the past. If the extemporaneous method is more nearly the Gospel ideal of service, then a plea for beauty or adornment in worship at the expense of spirituality is inadmissible. The net result of the discussion is more apt to be a decision to impose nothing obligatory in the liturgical line upon the Church, while facilities may properly be offered to any congregation to so enrich its services if it desire. But one thing at all events is to be demanded, and that is that no such innovations be allowed to banish all extemporaneous prayer from the public desk. Let there be some freedom of play in the matter. An optional modest liturgy is one thing, and perhaps desirable, but an obligatory and exclusive liturgy will never do.—*The Observer*, N. Y. (Pres.).

Evolution.

EVOLUTION, it is said, is simply God's method of doing things. This is a proposition which does not need to be disputed. It may be taken for granted. Wherever we find in any realm of being a law of continuity, cause, and consequence forever following each other in unbroken line, with never an addition of any new force from without, we may safely affirm that that is God's method of doing things, at least His method of doing things in that part of the realm of nature and life. But is God shut up to one single method of doing things? Has God Himself no freedom? There is nothing more certain in our thinking than that we, at any rate, possess a certain quality of spiritual freedom. The universal conscious-

ness of mankind on this point cannot be a mistake, evolution or no evolution. If man's life is not fastened down into the iron groove of necessitated causation and continuity, so that he is limited to only one method of doing things, why need it be asserted that God has less freedom of action than we have? When a man boasting that he is a "radical" evolutionist undertakes to explain not only the natural world but the spiritual world as well, including all the great facts of the Bible and of Christian history, by the glib assumption that the method of the radical evolution is the only method God has ever used even in the moral government of men, he is liable to deceive himself, if not others also, by a specious facility in the use of mere words. Nature does not abhor a vacuum more than does such a subject as this refuse to give answer to one who begins by ignoring one half the facts in the case, or who only thinks at the question without trying, patiently and consistently, to think it through.—*The Interior*, Chicago (Pres.).

It may be suggested that Canon Gore's reconciliation of Genesis and evolution is too much an afterthought. No one saw in Genesis the gradual development now found there until the theory of evolution was generally accepted. Although Canon Gore shows real liberality, yet it is evident that his is an attempt to bring science to the aid of old doctrines. He says that the essence of the doctrine of the fall in the Bible is "that, when first the spirit of man was breathed into an animal organism, it was a childlike spirit in direct relation to a divine will; and that it might, if it would, have followed the path of development marked out for it by the will; and that, if it had taken

that path, the lower animal nature which so fatally disfigured and corrupted the story of human life would have been spiritualized and robbed of its moral poison." It would appear that science, however, states the facts as it finds them, and makes no attempt, even so liberal a one as this, to patch up a truce where none is required. On all such questions as the origin of man and the nature of primitive society it is best to take the word of science as the final one.—*Christian Register, Boston* (Unit.).

Unity.

THE division of our American Christendom is its sad reproach. Our Roman Catholic brethren never tire of declaring that they are Catholic, and that we who have inherited the unfortunate name "Protestant" are split into a hundred competing and conflicting sects. It is true that we are. Some of these sects recognize and fellowship each other in a limited way, and others do not. Yet most of them are ready to admit that others besides themselves are true and regular Christian churches, and are willing to receive from them courteous messages at their national meetings. Yet these hundred and more denominations have no public, visible, formal bond of union; the Evangelical Alliance is hardly such. For all the world can see, they are rivals; and such they very often are. They do not come together in towns, or cities, or counties, or States, or in the nature of affectionate fellowship and consultation. Their more Christian young people's societies may do so, but the churches themselves do not. Now, this attitude of scarce more than armed truce is simply wrong. It is a sin before God. It ought to be correct-

ed. We heartily approve the efforts made to bring together into corporate union, here and there, two or three denominations. We earnestly wish that Northern and Southern Presbyterians, Northern and Southern Methodists, the Congregationalists, and the Christian Connection might unite; but such a union, desirable as it would be, would not heal the main divisions. A far larger necessity is that which would unite in confederation of council and service those denominations which cannot yet combine in corporate unity. Here is work for those who love the unity of the faith.—*The Independent, N. Y.* (Undenom.).

The Resurrection.

IN the faith of Jesus Christ death was simply the departure of the spirit from the body. When He came to the chamber of death, He called back the spirit of the maiden to arouse again the sleeping body; when He met the funeral procession, He called back the spirit of the young man to reanimate the lifeless body; when He came to the closed tomb, He called with a loud voice to the not far distant spirit of Lazarus to come back and bring the body forth into light and evident life again; when the penitent brigand asked to be remembered, His reply was, "This day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise;" when His own body was being dissolved and His spirit was escaping from its prison-house, He felt Himself departing, not to the charnel-house of the dead, not to a long and dreamy sleep, not to a shadowy Hades, not to an ante-room of immortality to await a future resurrection, but to the Father of immortal spirits, to Him concerning whom He had said, "God is not the God of the

dead but of the living." This is the first truth writ large in this last word of the Son of God: death is also resurrection. Earth to earth, dust to dust, ashes to

ashes, is not all; Christ teaches us to add the words, the Spirit to God who gave it.—*The Outlook*, N. Y. (Undenontf.).

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

CONDUCTED BY REV. CHARLES R. GILLETT, LIBRARIAN OF UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH defended against the views and arguments of Voltaire, Paine, Colenso, Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen. By D. MACDILL, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Apologetics in the Theological Seminary, Xenia, O. Dayton, O.: W. J. Shuey, 1896. vi. + 275 pp., 8vo.

This volume, which has grown out of lectures to the author's classes, is a fresh attempt to demonstrate that the arguments of the critics are singly and collectively baseless, their premises and conclusions being alike false, and that the internal evidence of every kind concurs with the external evidence to prove that the whole Pentateuch was written in the age of Moses, and by no other than Moses himself.

The spirit in which the author approaches his task is well exhibited in the opening sentences: "The whole discussion, as carried on by the leading analytic critics, is permeated by the doctrine of evolution. Their aim and effort are to show, by means of this doctrine, that God Almighty had nothing to do in the production of the Pentateuch or any other portion of the Bible, just as the atheistic evolutionists have been endeavoring to eliminate from the minds of men all belief in the theistic origin and government of the universe." The leaders of the modern school are "rationalists, sceptics, veritable infidels," men who "under the Old Testament dispensation, according to the Mosaic Law,

would have been stoned to death for blasphemy." We may perhaps infer from the emphasis with which this is brought out, that the author would not be averse to seeing the Mosaic Law revived for a little while.

According to Dr. MacDill, the true founder of modern criticism is Voltaire, who not only is the spiritual father of the whole race of critics (pp. 22, 24), but anticipated "nearly all the points embraced in the analytic criticism, and also most of the arguments employed by the critics in maintaining them" (p. 14). Inasmuch as the very idea of analytic criticism is foreign to Voltaire, this seems to be a slight exaggeration; and it is also an exaggeration to affirm that most of the objections urged by Voltaire against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch were originated by himself (p. 17). Among those adduced by Dr. MacDill, at least, I discover hardly any which had not been raised before Voltaire, either by the critics of the sixteenth century, or by the English deists, who, strangely enough, are not mentioned at all. The question of Voltaire's originality is, however, not one about which we are greatly concerned. It is much more important to note that the prevailing attitude of the eighteenth century toward the sources, not of Biblical history alone, but of ancient history universally—the scepticism which is best characterized by Fontenelle's word, "*l'histoire n'est qu'une fable convenue*," which found material embodiment in Bayle's Dictionary, and of which, in our field, Volney is the best exponent—this attitude is at the farthest possible remove from that of modern scholars; and that it was criticism alone which combatted and finally overcame the general historical skepticism of the last century. The difference between Voltaire and Reuss or Kuenen, for example, is nothing less than the entire conception of history. There is not a syllable in the book to show that the author is aware of this difference. To him all are infidels alike; the distinctions they may choose to make among themselves probably seem to him matters of purely private concern.

In this latest *refutatio omnium criticorum* there is little

room for novelty ; the reader acquainted with apologetic literature from Huet and Vitranga to Green and Sayce, will find for the most part the familiar answers to the familiar objections ; indeed by this time he may often have his choice of a half dozen answers. The occasional original contributions of the author are not always happy. A very elementary knowledge of Hebrew would have sufficed to prevent him from putting forward his emended translation of *לָאֶרֶץ יְרֵשָׁתָּהּ* in Deut. ii. 12, which he would render "to land [not, *the* land] of his possession," "as there is no article in the original"! He has also accumulated considerable misinformation from others ; for example, that Josephus says that *Dan* in Gen. xiv. 14 "designates one of the forks of the Jordan, *Jor* being the other" (p. 39) ; or that "the old Babylonian and Assyrian languages were as similar to that of the Old Testament as two modern dialects of English are to each other," for which Sayce is made responsible (p. 60 ; cf. p. 157) ; or that the critics believe the Passover—which, in fact, they regard as a feast of the nomadic Hebrews, the only one in the calendar which antedates the settlement in Canaan—to have been instituted in the time of Josiah, or in the exile (p. 243) ; and similarly in many other cases.

In quoting the critics Dr. MacDill has followed the commendable custom of giving their own words, as well as his translation. Unfortunately, he transcribes very inaccurately. He has no more respect for French accents than for higher critics. In a quotation of five lines and a half (p. 41), I have counted fourteen errors, and this does not seem to be above the average. The translations from the French are not so bad ; though "the text . . . speaks of the past definite, not of the future," for "in the perfect tense, not in the future," suggests "the scole of Stratford atte Bowe." Wellhausen's German has more than once proved too much for Dr. MacDill's : the Chronicler's *gesetzesselige Phantasie* becomes "the law-blessed (crazed) fancy of the chronicler" (p. 210) ; Wellhausen says that a certain story betrays at once its *geistliche Mache* (clerical

fabrication), according to our author, its "ghostly make-up."

The tone of the book is generally serious, and the style inoffensive, though heavy, but there are occasional lapses to the level of the following: "The lagging analytics [a term of opprobrium which the author seems to have coined] may about as well go the whole figure with their leaders, and declare the whole account of the Mosaic tabernacle an enormous falsification, so far as views touching the Pentateuch and inspiration are concerned. The charge of small lying and small thieving effect [*sic*] reputation nearly as much as charges of larger criminality. God is not more disposed to make little liars or little thieves His special agents than big ones. If falsification is to be charged on any part of the Scriptures, it may as well be on a grand scale."

GEORGE F. MOORE.

Andover Theological Seminary.

BRIEF REVIEWS AND NOTES.

Dr. George A. Gordon, the minister of the Old South Church, Boston, is well known in many ways, and not least of all on account of a recent volume on "The Witness to Immortality in Literature, Philosophy, and Life." It was most fitting that he should be chosen as the first "Ingersoll lecturer on the Immortality of Man" at Harvard University. This lectureship is modelled after the famous Dudleian lecture of earlier times, and promises to bear good fruit. The first lecture makes a book of one hundred and thirty duodecimo pages, and is entitled *Immortality and the New Theodicy*. It deals with the conditions of the problem as these have been affected by recent progress in scientific and theological thought, and it presents a broad and wide outlook. The subject is illustrated from novel points of view and the results enforced by close reasoning and on cogent grounds. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$1.00.)

To catalogue the results which have arisen from misinterpreting the Bible by means of mistaken methods and wrong principles were an immense task, and to follow them out into their ramifications and effects would require the co-operative effort of enough men to represent a lifetime. No single individual can do it, and no one knows all the evils that have come from this source. A welcome is therefore to be extended to the book which sets forth soberly the principles which are in accord with sound reason, enlightened common sense, and true biblical knowledge. This is the task set for himself by Dr. Walter F. Adeney, the Professor of New Testament Exegesis in New College, London, when he undertook to tell *How to Read the Bible*, and to give "hints for Sunday-School Teachers and other Bible Students." It is a little book, and it is therefore not an exhaustive treatise on hermeneutics, but it is one that has the root of the matter in it. In order to give a slight notion of the character of the work, we quote the "principles" which he formulates for the proper understanding of the Scriptures: 1. Be careful to work on a correct text. 2. Endeavor to understand the exact meaning of the words and phrases studied. 3. Read every passage in the light of its context. 4. Note the distinctive character and purpose of each book of Scripture. 5. Make a study of the works of each Scripture writer. . . . 6. Study each part of the Bible in connection with the period when it was written, and take into account the circumstances of its origin. 7. Trace the historical development of revelation. 8. Study the Bible in sympathy with the spirit in which it was written. 9. Use common intelligence in the reading of Scripture. Truly these are primary lessons, but unfortunately they are not superfluous. It will be a happy day when they are so well known and so consistently practised that their statement will be needless. (New York: Thomas Whitaker. 50 cents.)

A hearty welcome is to be extended to the second volume in the series of three, on the life of Christ, by

Edmond Stapfer, professor in the faculty of Protestant theology at Paris. The previous volume dealt with "Jesus Christ before His Ministry;" this one is entitled *Jesus Christ during His Ministry*, and both have been translated by Mrs. Louise Seymour Houghton, who enjoys a well nigh unrivalled reputation as a translator from the French. One reads these pages with such ease and delight that the thought of a foreign original never for a moment crosses one's mind. This is high praise, and it is intended to be such. The book itself is not a life of Jesus after the ordinary style. Many of its points of view and statements of fact will strike the general reader as novel, and sometimes as untrue, at least untrue to the ordinary conception, especially to that ruled by dogmatic preconceptions. But with these divergencies from current opinions we are not concerned except to note their existence, and to draw attention to the fact that their statement in plain language is calculated to advance the truth by antagonism if not by acquiescence. The author's method will be new to many readers, and it cannot but prove inspiring and suggestive. Instead of going into the details of the chronology, the author writes as one who desires to place on record his convictions after reading the life of the Christ, his interpretation of the meaning of that wonderful existence and being, his philosophy of the purpose and intent of that Gospel message which He brought. The author indicates his aim in these words: "I propose to speak above all things of Jesus Himself, what He purposed to do, what He professed to be, and, as my general title says, what He said of His *person*, what *authority* He claimed, and what *work* He desired to do." This book has some of the qualities of an inspiring teacher, one who incites his pupils by giving them new glimpses of familiar truths, who opens up new ranges of vision, and who alters the appearance of things by changing their perspective. This calls for new adjustments, advance, differentiation, in which consists progress. Even though a reader fail to agree with the author, he can scarcely lay the book down from lack of interest

in the method or the subject. (New York : Scribner. \$1.25.)

It is of great importance that Sabbath-school children should be given a compendious view of the Bible as a whole. One of the difficulties with the International Lessons is that they afford a sort of dissolving view of sections of Biblical history, without insisting enough upon the connection of the parts. To meet the latter need such books as *Bible Study by Books*, by Rev. Henry T. Sell, are useful. The present work is constructed on conservative lines with a few sporadic traces of modern critical results, but these will not startle even the staunchly orthodox. (New York and Chicago : Revell. 35 cents.)

Just as a man's character is better seen in the little things of his life, so a truer light is thrown on his real life by minor incidents than by those which fill the eye of the world. A case in point is given by a little volume on *Ulysses S. Grant*: conversations and unpublished letters. It is from the pen of M. J. Cramer, D.D., LL.D., ex-United States Minister to Denmark and to Switzerland. Being the brother-in-law of General Grant, he enjoyed exceptional privileges, and he has used them to recount some traits of his relative which make pleasant reading. One is only surprised that he has produced a volume of such moderate dimensions, a fact which is due to a business-like way of letting the story speak for itself and of avoiding all unnecessary padding. (New York : Eaton & Mains. 90 cents.)

Two little paper-covered books have come to us from the Revell Co.: *The History of the Holy Dead*, a suggestive study of the teaching of some portions of revelation as to the state of souls after death, by Rev. James M. Gray, D.D.; and *What is Christian Science?* containing an examination of the metaphysical, theological, and therapeutic theories of the system of Mrs. Eddy, by Rev. P. C. Wolcott, of Highland Park, Ill. It is a caustic critique upon the theories and dogmas of the mind-cure, or whatever it may be called, and

may be examined with advantage by those who are called upon to contend with the vagaries of such doctrinaires. (Each 15 cents.)

SUBJECT INDEX TO THEOLOGICAL PERIODICALS.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS RECORD.

Af. M. E. R.	African M. E. Church Review. (Quarterly.)	Luth. Q.	Lutheran Quarterly.
Am. Cath. Q. R.	American Catholic Quarterly Review.	Meth. R.	Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)
Am. J. T.	American Journal of Theology.	Meth. R. So.	Methodist Review, South. (Quarterly.)
Bib. Sac.	Bibliotheca Sacra. (Quarterly.)	Miss. H.	Missionary Herald.
Bib. W.	Biblical World.	Miss. R.	Missionary Review.
Can. M. R.	Canadian Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)	New W.	The New World. (Quarterly.)
Chr. L.	Christian Literature.	Pre. M.	Preacher's Magazine.
Chr. Q.	Christian Quarterly.	Presb. Q.	Presbyterian Quarterly.
Church Q. R.	Church Quarterly Review.	Presb. Ref. R.	Presbyterian and Reformed Review. (Quarterly.)
Ex.	Expositor.	Prot. Ep. R.	Protestant Episc. Review.
Ex. T.	Expository Times.	Ref. C. R.	Reformed Church Review. (Quarterly.)
Hom. R.	Homiletic Review.	Treas.	The Treasury.
Luth. C. R.	Lutheran Church Review.	Yale R.	The Yale Review. (Quarterly.)

Unless otherwise specified, all references are to the April number of periodicals.

- Ambrose.** (E. T. Horn) Luth. C. R.
American Christianity. (L. W. Bacon) Chr. L.
Anglican review, Our. (W. M. Sinclair) Hom. R.
"A peculiar treasure" (Mal. iii. 7). (R. B. Woodworth) Presb. Q.
Apocalypse of Baruch, Mr. Charles'. (J. R. Harris) Ex.
Apocalyptic teaching of our Lord. (H. Kingman). Bib. W. (Mar.).
Apologetics, Study in Jewish. (S. Fritschel and E. N. Heimann) Luth. C. R.
Apostles and prophets, Foundation of. (K. Bockock) Prot. Ep. R. (Mar.).
Architecture's sacred story. (C. E. Haupt) Luth. C. R.
Argyll, Duke of, and his work. (J. W. Monser) Chr. Q.
Aryans, Origin of the. (A. J. Heller) Ref. C. R.
Assyrian empire, Dissolution of the. (J. F. McCurdy) Hom. R.
Athanasius. (G. F. Spieker) Luth. C. R.
Augustine. (A. G. Voigt) Luth. C. R.
Babylonians, Text-book literature of the. (M. Jastrow, Jr.), Bib. W.
"Back to Christ." (C. M. Mead) Prot. Ep. R.
Baptist, Why I am a. (R. S. McArthur) Treas.
Barrows, Dr. J. H., in India. Chr. L.
Bible, English, and English writers. (C. M. Cady) Bib. W. (Mar.).
Blessing, Purpose of a special. (F. J. Mallett) Treas.
Burma, How the Gospel spreads in. (D. Gilmore) Miss. R.
Caste in India. (W. J. Wanless) Miss. R.
Ceylon, Progress in. (M. Leitch) Miss. R.
Charlemagne. (J. C. F. Rupp) Luth. C. R.
Chaucer, Geoffrey. (T. W. Hunt) Treas.

- Christian Endeavor movement**, Strength and weakness of the. (E. H. Delk) Luth.Q.
- Christian dialogue**, New second-century. (F. C. Conybeare) Ex.
- Christianity**, Genius of. (B. A. Hinsdale) Chr.Q.
- Christianity** and social problems. (Z. S. Holbrook) Bib.Sac.
- Christian's manual of arms**, Rev. 2-3. (G. H. Gilbert) Bib.W.
- Chronicles**, The, a targum. (W. E. Barnes) Ex.T.
- Chrysostom**. (C. K. Binder) Luth.C.R.
- Chrysostom as a preacher**. (N. R. Melhorn) Luth.C.R.
- Church**, The. (G. C. Berkemeier) Luth.C.R.
- Church** and lawlessness in society. (E. M. Grahn) Luth.C.R.
- Church reform**, Hints on. (Dr. Jessopp) Chr.L.
- Church year**, Is the recognition of the, by all Christians desirable? (R. De W. Mallary) Bib.Sac.
- Churches need**, What our. (H. D. Spaeth) Luth.C.R.
- City life**, Some decadent tendencies in. (F. L. Ferguson) Presb.Q.
- Classical literature**, How shall the preacher study, most profitably. (J. O. Murray) Hom.R.
- Cobbe**, Frances Power, Life of. (B. S. Grammer) Prot.Ep.R. (Mar.).
- Congregational Church polity**. (M. Burnham) Chr.Q.
- Constantine the Great**. (H. W. Elson) Luth.C.R.
- Critics criticised**. (R. K. Sheldon) Hom.R.
- Death**—probation—judgment. (E. C. Gordon) Presb.Q.
- Denominational consciousness** among our people, How can we best cultivate a. (A. B. Koplin) Ref.C.R.
- Divine healing**, or faith cure. (W. E. Hull) Luth.Q.
- Drummond**, Henry. (J. Stalker) Ex.
- Drummond**, Professor Henry, teacher, author, traveller, Christian. (H. A. B.) Chr.L.
- Easter**. (B. Hart) Treas.
- Edgeworth**, Maria. (L. M. Blackford) Prot.Ep.R.
- Education**, State and Church. (B. Sadtler) Luth.C.R.
- Elliot**, George, Socialism of. (G. H. Combs) Chr.Q.
- Evolution** as taught in Scripture. (A. E. Deitz) Luth.Q.
- Faith**, Speculative view of. (W. J. Wright) Presb.Q.
- Faith**, Unrecognized. (W. E. Barton) Treas.
- Faith cure**, Divine healing or. (W. E. Hull) Luth.Q.
- "Faith-work"**. (A. T. Pierson) Miss.R.
- Female missions in India**. (E. Storrow) Miss.R.
- Field**, Frederick. (J. H. Burn) Ex T.
- Free Church unity**: the new movement. (H. P. Hughes) Chr.L.
- Genesis**, Cosmogony of, and its reconcilers. (H. Morton) Bib.Sac.
- Gregory the Great**. (M. C. Horine) Luth.C.R.
- Hildebrand**. (M. J. Bieber) Luth.C.R.
- Hinduism** as it is. (J. Chamberlain) Miss.R.
- Housing question** and scientific reform. (W. Caldwell) Bib.Sac.
- India**, Caste in. (W. J. Wanless) Miss.R.
- India**, Female missions in. (E. Storrow) Miss.R.
- India**, First impressions of. (H. G. Guinness) Miss.R.
- India**, Results of mission work in. (J. H. Wyckoff) Miss.R.
- Infant salvation**, Development of the doctrine of. (B. B. Warfield) Chr.L.
- Inspiration of the Scriptures**. (J. C. Jacoby) Luth.Q.
- Institutional church in New York**. Treas.

- Institutional church**, Symposium on the. (R. S. Pardington) Hom.R.
James, Epistle of, Expository preaching with especial reference to the (R. De W. Mallary) Bib.W.
James, Gospel according to. (J. A. K. Bain) Ex.T.
Jerome. (H. Peters) Luth.C.R.
Jesus, Could, err? (T. Whitelaw) Ex.T.
John's, St., "last hour." (G. G. Findlay) Ex.
Judgment, Probation—death. (E. C. Gordon) Presb.Q.
Justification, regeneration and, in Lutheran dogmatic theology, Relative positions of. (F. H. Knubel) Luth.Q.
Lamb on the throne. (G. Matheson) Ex.
Lord's Supper, Lutheran doctrine of the. (T. A. Himes) Luth.Q.
Lutheran Church, Genesis of the German, in the land of Penn. (J. F. Sachse) Luth.C.R.
Lutheran Church in Georgia, Early history of the. (D. M. Gilbert) Luth.Q.
Manual of arms, Christian's. (G. H. Gilbert) Bib.W.
Medieval moulders of the Church and makers of its history. Luth.C.R.
Melanchthon as theologian. (G. F. Behringer) Luth.Q.
"Mind of the Master." (J. F. Cannon) Presb.Q.
Ministry, Doctrine of the. (G. W. Wenner) Luth.Q.
Missions, Apostolic and modern. (C. Martin) Presb.Ref.R.
Mission work in India, Results of. (J. H. Wyckoff) Miss.R.
Morality, No national stability without. (C. W. Super) Bib.Sac.
Morals before Moses. (H. Osgood) Presb.Ref.R.
Music, Ideal of church. (E. Dickinson) Bib.Sac.
Nineteenth century movement. (J. H. Garrison) Chr.Q.
Normative church polity. (C. O'N. Martindale) Presb.Q.
Old Testament canon. (W. W. Elwang) Presb.Q.
Packard, J., Recollections of a long life. Prot.Ep.R. (Mar., April).
Palm Sunday to Easter, From. (G. B. F. Hallock) Treas.
Paul (St.), Have we authentic portraits of. (W. H. Bradley) Bib.W. (Mar.).
Pestalozzi, the Swiss educational reformer. (N. C. Schaeffer) Ref.C.R.
Polygamous applicants. (D. L. Gifford) Miss.R.
Preaching, Efficient. (R. F. Sample) Presb.Ref.R.
Preaching, Expository, with especial reference to the Epistle of James. (R. De W. Mallary) Bib.W.
Preaching, preparation for, What are the things most essential in. (W. G. Blaikie) Hom.R.
Preaching, Relative value of topical and expository. (T. D. Wither- spoon) Hom.R.
Princeton College, Planting of. (J. De Witt) Presb.Ref.R.
Probation—death—judgment. (E. C. Gordon) Presb.Q.
Quirinius, Census of. (W. M. Ramsay) Ex.
Rabbinism in the Church. (E. T. Horn) Luth.C.R.
Rationalism's claim to exclusive scholarship. (H. Osgood) Hom.R.
Reformed Church, Relation of the, to new theology. (J. C. Bowman) Ref.C.R.
Regeneration and justification in Lutheran dogmatic theology, Relative positions of. (F. H. Knubel) Luth.Q.
Religion, Spencer's philosophy of. (E. S. Carr) Bib.Sac.

- Rephidim**, God's ensign at. (H. C. Trumbull) Ex.
Reynolds, Henry Robert. (W. C. Shearer) Ex. T.
Sacred words, Some: the trisagion, the hallelujah, and the amen. (J. A. Seiss) Luth. C. R.
Sacrifice, In what sense have the clergy of the Church of England to offer. (J. H. Elliott) Prot. Ep. R. (Mar.).
Scholarship, Decline of ministerial. (R. L. Dabney) Presb. Q.
Science, Paradoxes of. (G. F. Wright) Bib. Sac.
Sermonizing. (A. E. Truxal) Ref. C. R.
Slavery, Abolition of, in Madagascar. (W. E. Cousins) Miss. R.
Socialism, Life of. (A. G. Gekeler) Ref. C. R.
Socialism in Italy. (D. W. Fisher) Presb. Ref. R.
"Soul" and "Spirit", Biblical usage of. (W. H. Hodge) Presb. Ref. R.
Spencer's philosophy of religion. (E. S. Carr) Bib. Sac.
Sunday-School—its present peril. (T. D. Witherspoon) Presb. Q.
Tell-el-Amarna letters. (J. M. P. Metcalf) Bib. Sac.
Tennyson's "In Memoriam." (T. W. Hunt) Bib. Sac.
Theologians, Some recent English: Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, Jewett, Hatch. (A. M. Fairbairn) Chr. L.
Theological thought, Present trend of. (J. I. Swander) Ref. C. R.
Witness of Jesus to Himself and Christianity. (A. S. Weber) Ref. C. R.
Worship, Problem of public. (T. D. Darling) Presb. Ref. R.

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

Biblical World.

Chicago, March, 1897.

- Apocalyptic teaching of our Lord.
 Have we authentic portraits of St. Paul?
 English Bible and English writers.

April, 1897.

- Text-book literature of the Babylonians.
 Christian's manual of arms, Rev. 2-3.
 Expository preaching with especial reference to the Epistle of James.

Bibliotheca Sacra.

Oberlin, April, 1897.

- Paradoxes of science.
 Spencer's philosophy of religion.
 Tennyson's "In Memoriam."
 Cosmogony of Genesis and its reconcilers.

No national stability without morality.

Is the recognition of the church year by all Christians desirable?

Ideal of church music.
 Tell el-Amarna letters.
 Christianity and social problems.
 Housing question and scientific reform.

The Christian Quarterly.

Columbia, Mo., April, 1897.

- Nineteenth century movement.
 Congregational Church polity.
 Genius of Christianity.
 Socialism of George Eliot.
 Duke of Argyll and his work.

Christian Literature.

New York, April, 1897.

- Development of the doctrine of infant salvation.

Some recent English theologians
—Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort,
Jowett, Hatch.

Hints on church reform.

Free Church unity: the new
movement.

Professor Henry Drummond,
teacher, author, traveller, Chris-
tian.

Dr. J. H. Barrows in India.
American Christianity.

The Expositor.

London, April, 1897.

St. John's "Last Hour."

Mr. Charles' Apocalypse of Ba-
ruch.

Lamb on the Throne.

Census of Quirinius.

Henry Drummond.

God's ensign at Rephidim.

New second-century Christian
Dialogue.

Expository Times.

Edinburgh, April, 1897.

Gospel according to James.

Could Jesus err?

Henry Robert Reynolds.

The Chronicles a Targum.

Frederick Field.

The Homiletic Review.

New York, April, 1897.

Rationalism's claim to exclusive
scholarship.

What are the things most essen-
tial in preparation for preach-
ing?

How shall the preacher study
classical literature most profit-
ably?

Relative value of topical and ex-
pository preaching.

Our Anglican review.

Dissolution of the Assyrian em-
pire.

Symposium on the institutional
church.

Critics criticised.

The Lutheran Church Review.

Philadelphia, April, 1897.

Education, State and Church.
Church and lawlessness in society.

Rabbinism in the Church.

The Church.

Study in Jewish apologetics.

Some sacred words: the trisagion,
the hallelujah, and the amen.

Mediæval moulders of the Church
and makers of its history.

Architecture's sacred story.

Genesis of the German Lutheran
Church in the land of Penn.

What our churches need.

The Lutheran Quarterly.

Gettysburg, April, 1897.

Early history of the Lutheran
Church in Georgia.

Relative positions of regeneration
and justification in Lutheran
dogmatic theology.

Doctrine of the ministry.

Evolution as taught in Scripture.

Inspiration of the Scriptures.

Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's
Supper.

Melanchthon as theologian.

Divine healing, or faith cure.

Strength and weakness of the
Christian Endeavor movement.

Missionary Review.

New York, April, 1897.

"Faith work."

Hinduism as it is.

How the Gospel spreads in Bur-
ma.

Progress in Ceylon.

Caste in India.

Polygamous applicants.

Results of mission work in India.

Female missions in India.

Medical school for Christian wom-
en in India.

First impressions of India.

Abolition of slavery in Madagas-
car.

The Presbyterian Quarterly.

Richmond, April, 1897.

Old Testament canon.
 Speculative view of faith.
 Decline of ministerial scholarship.
 Sunday-school—its present peril.
 "Mind of the Master."
 Some decadent tendencies in city life.
 Probation—death—judgment.
 Normative church polity and some abnormal outgrowths.
 A "Peculiar Treasure" (Mal. iii. 17).

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review.

Philadelphia, April, 1897.

Planting of Princeton College.
 Socialism in Italy.
 Problem of public worship.
 Apostolic and modern missions.
 Biblical usage of "soul" and "spirit."
 Morals before Moses.
 Efficient preaching.

Protestant Episcopal Review.

Theological Seminary, March, 1897.

In what sense have the clergy of the Church of England power to offer sacrifice?
 Recollections of a long life.
 Foundation of apostles and prophets.
 Life of Frances Powers Cobbe.

April, 1897.

The summons "back to Christ."
 Recollections of a long life.
 Maria Edgeworth.

Reformed Church Review.

Lancaster, April, 1897.

Relation of the Reformed Church to new theology.

Present trend of theological thought.

Witness of Jesus to Himself and Christianity.

How can we best cultivate a denominational consciousness among our people?

Pestalozzi, the Swiss educational reformer.

Sermonizing.

Life of socialism.

Origin of the Aryans.

The Treasury.

New York, April, 1897.

From Palm Sunday to Easter.

Easter.

Purpose of special blessing.

Unrecognized faith.

Why I am a Baptist?

Institutional church in New York.

Geoffrey Chaucer.

MAGAZINES.

THE contents of the ATLANTIC MONTHLY for May are: "The Problems of Rural New England" ("A Remote Village," Philip Morgan; "A Farming Community," Alvan F. Sanborn); "Real Utopias in the Arid West," William E. Smythe; "Nansen's Heroic Journey," N. S. Shaler; "Art in the Public Schools," Sarah W. Whitman; "The Ramparts of Port Royal," Charles G. D. Roberts; "My Sixty Days in Greece," Basil L. Gildersleeve; "The Deathless Diary," Agnes Repplier; "The Juggler," Charles Egbert Craddock; "Cheerful Yesterdays," Thomas Wentworth Higginson; "Notes of a Trip to Izumo," Lafcadio Hearn; "The Story of an Untold Love," Paul Leicester Ford; "The Enemy Listens," Josephine Preston Peabody.

THE contents of the CENTURY for May are: "A Suburban Country Place," Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer; "Hugh Wynne, Free Quaker," S. Weir Mitchell; "Bicycling through the Dolomites," George E. Waring, Jr.; "'Anti-Babel,' or Professor Sandfog's Universal Language," William Henry Bishop; "Scientific Kite-Flying, with Especial Reference to the Hill Experiments," J. B. Millet; "Experiments with Kites," Hugh D. Wise, U. S. A.; "Photographing from Kites," William A. Eddy; "Tennessee and its Centennial," Marks White Handly; "Campaigning with Grant," Horace Porter; "A Benedictine Garden," Alice Brown; "The Days of Jeanne d'Arc," Mary Hartwell Catherwood; "The Withdrawal of the French from Mexico," Lieutenant-General John M. Schofield; "The Fall of the Second Empire, as Related to French Intervention in Mexico," Matias Romero; "The Royal Family of Greece," Benjamin Ide Wheeler; "Crete, the Island of Discord," Demetrius Kalopothakes; "'Ubi Sunt Qui Ante Nos,'" Edmund Clarence Stedman.

THE contents of May HARPER'S are: "'Cross-Country Riding,'" Caspar Whitney; "The Martian," George Du Maurier; "A Few Native Orchids and their Insect Sponsors," William Hamilton Gibson; "White Man's Africa," Poultney Bigelow; "Two Undescribed Portraits of Shakespeare," John Corbin; "Geological Progress of the Century," Henry Smith Williams, M.D.; "The Captured Dream," Octave Thanet; "English Country-House Life," George W. Smalley; "The Education of Bob," Rebecca Harding Davis; "A Guardian Angel," Harriet Pres-

cott Spofford; "The Hundred Years' Campaign," Professor Francis N. Thorpe; "The Lion-Tamer," Henry Gallup Paine.

MAY LIPPINCOTT'S contains: "Jason Hildreth's Identity," Virna Woods; "Some Bird-Songs," Henry Oldys; "On the Sante Fé Trail," William Thomson; "French Pioneers in America," Alva Fitzpatrick; "Earning a Living in China," Dora E. W. Spratt; "Marthy's Dress," Carrie Blake Morgan; "Early Man in America," Harvey B. Bashore; "Life in the Cotton Belt," Francis Albert Doughty; "A 'Star Route' Case," Mary E. Stickney; "The Beginnings of Liberty in New York," Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer; "My Pennsylvanian," Joseph A. Altsheler; "Hard Times among the Heroines," Eva A. Madden.

THE May number of McCLURE'S MAGAZINE is especially abundant and interesting in the matter of portraits of famous people. In illustration of a paper by Miss Tarbell on the remarkable work of G. C. Cox in photographic portraiture, there are truly speaking likenesses of Donald G. Mitchell ("Ik Marvel"), Walt Whitman, Eleanora Duse, Henry Ward Beecher, and others; and a series of life portraits of Daniel Webster exhibit that most august and impressive of great men at close intervals from middle life to the year of his death. Some of the Webster portraits have never before been published; and all have interesting histories, which are set forth in notes by Mr. Charles Henry Hart.

SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE for May contains: "Undergraduate Life at Harvard," Edward S. Martin; "Memory," Charles C. Nott, Jr.; "Harvard College in the Seventies," Robert Grant; "Golf,"

H. J. Whigham, Amateur Champion of America; "The Working of a Bank," Charles D. Lanier; "A New England May Festival—a Story in Six Pictures," drawn by Maude and Genevieve Cowles; "Soldiers of Fortune," Richard Harding Davis; "The Whirlwind Road," Charles Edwin Markham; "London: as Seen by C. D. Gibson—The Drawing-Room;" "Betwixt Cup and Lip," Grace Howard Peirce; "The Story of a Play," W. D. Howells; "A May Song," Archibald Lampman.

LITERARY NOTES.

NEXT month Messrs. Cassell & Co. will publish "My Life in Christ; or, Moments of Spiritual Serenity and Contemplation, of Reverent Feeling, of Earnest Self-Amendment, and of Peace in God," being extracts from the diary of the Most Rev. John Ilitch Sergieff ("Father John"), of St. Andrew's Cathedral, Cronstadt, Russia, translated with the author's sanction from the second and supplemented edition by E. E. Goulaeff, St. Petersburg.

DR. FRITZ HOMMEL, the Assyriologist, has written an extensive work on the ancient Hebrew tradition, in which he endeavors to show the inadequacy of the purely literary methods employed by the "higher critics" of the Old Testament. The book will be published by the S. P. C. K.

A UNIFORM cheap edition of the Hibbert Lectures is now being issued by Messrs. Williams & Norgate, in monthly volumes. Professor A. H. Sayce, "On the Religion of Ancient Assyria and Babylonia," was issued last month, and is followed this week by the Rev. Dr. Hatch's lectures "On the Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church."

THE first volume of Dean Spence's new work, entitled "The Church of England: a History for the People," will be shortly published by Messrs. Cassell & Co. It will contain a large number of pictures, consisting of reproductions of objects of historic interest, photographs of places, copies of noted pictures, maps, and original illustrations.

CHRONICLE, OBITUARY, AND CALENDAR.

COMPILED BY PROFESSOR GEORGE W. GILMORE, A.M.

CHRONICLE.

(Closes on the 10th.)

Feb. 28-Mar. 5.—Spring Conference of the (*Anglican*) Church Association, in Manchester, Eng.

Mar. 9.—Assembly of the *Free Church Council*, in London.

Mar. 17.—Meeting of the Fifth *International Sunday-School*

Lesson Committee, in Philadelphia, in preparation of the *International Lessons* for 1900-1905.

Mar. 23.—Meeting of Representatives of the *Baptist Young People's Union of America* (Northern Baptist) and the

- Southern Baptists' Young People's Union*, looking to co-operation ; at Nashville, Tenn.
- Mar. 26.—Birthday of *Neal Dow, International Prohibition Day*.
- Mar. 29.—Seventh Annual Meeting of the *National Christian League* for the Promotion of *Christian Purity*, in New York.
- Apr. 4.—Meeting of the General Conference of the *Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints* (Mormon), at Lamoni, Ia.
- Apr. 8.—Eighty-first Annual Meeting of the *New York Female Bible Society*, in New York City.
- Representative Clergymen of the Presbyterian Church have formed a *Presbyterian Church Service Society*.

PERSONAL.

- Monsignor Merry del Val* has arrived in Canada as *Apostolic Delegate*, to settle church difficulties in the Dominion.
- Dr. Hutchison*, of Bonnington, Edinburgh, has been nominated *Moderator* of the *United Presbyterian Church of Scotland's Synod*.
- Mr. William Dulles, Jr.*, Treasurer of the Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church, North, has resigned.
- The *Very Rev. Herbert Ma-ther*, Provost of the Cathedral of Inverness, has been chosen (Anglican) *Bishop of Antigua*.
- The *Rev. J. C. Roper, M.A.*, of Toronto, Canada, has been elected *Professor of Dogmatic Theology* in the *General Theological Seminary*, New York, in place of the *Rev. Dr. G. H. S. Walpole*, called to *Bede College*, Durham, Eng.

EDUCATIONAL—COLLEGES.

- The *Rev. James P. Faulkner* has been elected to the *presidency of Union College*, Bar-boursville, Ky.
- Professor G. P. Coler*, of Ann Arbor, Mich., has been offered the *presidency of Drake University*, Des Moines, Ia.
- The *School for Christian Workers*, at Springfield, Mass., has voted to change its name to "Bible Normal College."

OBITUARY.

- Arey, Rev. Charles* (Protestant Episcopal), *D.D.*, at Salem, Mass., Mar. 7, aged 75. He was born in Wellfleet, Mass.; took his Freshman year at Dartmouth, his Sophomore year at Harvard, and was graduated from Kenyon College, 1846; was ordained deacon, 1846; priest, 1848; his first parish was Trinity Church, Toledo, N. Y., and his successive charges were as follows: St. Paul's Church, Erie, Pa.; Christ Church, Ballston Spa, N. Y.; Grace Church, Jersey City, N. J.; Trinity Church, Fredonia, N. Y.; St. John's Church, Buffalo, N. Y.; and St. Peter's Church, Salem, Mass.

Brown, Rev. James (United Presbyterian), *D.D.*, in Holton, Kan., Mar. 15, aged 84. The record of his life is as follows: He was born Oct. 31, 1812, in Alyth, Perthshire, Scotland; was graduated at Hanover, Ind., in 1835, and studied theology at Canonsburg; was licensed June 26, 1839, by the Indiana Presbytery, and ordained Sept. 10, 1840, at Charters; was pastor of Peter's Creek, Sept., 1840-Dec. 5, 1843; of Madison and connections, Ind., May, 1844; released from Mt. Pleasant and Vernon, May, 1848, and from Madison, Nov., 1855; Keokuk, Ia., April, 1856-June 24, 1873; S. S. at Keokuk, 1874-75; pastor at Columbus City, Ia., July, 1876-April 4, 1883; was moderator of the General Assembly in 1876. Delegate to the Presbyterian Council in 1880. It will be noticed that he had been in the Gospel ministry for over fifty-six years.

Conde, Rev. Daniel D. (Presbyterian), *D.D.*, in Beloit, Wis., Mar. 8, aged 90. Dr. Conde was born in Charlton, N. Y.; he was graduated from Union College, 1831, and from Auburn Theological Seminary, 1834; he was ordained at Fredonia, N. Y., 1836; the same year he went to the Sandwich Islands under commission from the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, arriving in 1837; he was stationed at Hama on Main; he was transferred to Wailuku, 1848; after the death of his wife, he returned with his family to the United States, 1856; he settled in Beloit in 1862, where he has since resided.

Drummond, Professor Henry

(Free Church of Scotland, layman), *B.Sc., F.G.S., F.R.S.E.*, in London, Mar. 10, aged 45. He was born at Stirling, Scotland; he was a graduate of the Universities of Edinburgh and Tübingen; his father desired him to enter the ministry, but he was never ordained; while still at college he assisted Mr. Moody in evangelistic labors for two years; after his university studies were completed he became assistant to an Edinburgh clergyman, and played the same part when in Malta; on his return to Scotland he was made lecturer on science at the Free Church College in Glasgow, and subsequently became professor; he first came into note by the publication in book form of his "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" in 1883; meanwhile he had been travelling in almost all parts of the world, engaged in scientific research, his results being published in scientific journals; in 1888 appeared his "Tropical Africa"; but he was even more influential as a writer of religious and devotional booklets; what is probably the most popular and most fervent of his works, "The Greatest Thing in the World," appeared in 1890; this is said to have reached a sale of 200,000 copies; other noted booklets are "Pax Vobiscum," "The Changed Life," and "The Program of Christianity." In 1893 he again visited America (his "Greatest Thing in the World" was delivered at Northfield in 1887), and delivered the Lowell Lectures in Boston, printed in the volume "The Ascent of Man," which has been named his "Spiritual Law in the Natural World." The editor of the New

York *Evangelist* speaks of him as follows: "Henry Drummond seems too young to die, yet he has done his work, one peculiarly his own. There was in him personally the beauty of a pure and devout spirit, and in his writing the charm of a sincerity of faith which seemed a second sight. He had the gift of the 'twice-born,' he saw the invisible."

Grace, Most Rev. Thomas L. (Roman Catholic), *O.S.D.*, at St. Paul, Minn., Mar. 22, aged 82. He was born in Charleston, S. C.; studied in the seminary there; entered as a Dominican novice at St. Rose, Ky., 1830; was sent thence to Rome, where he pursued the seven years' course at the Minerva; he was ordained, 1839; returned to this country and took up missionary work in Kentucky, 1844; became pastor of the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, in Memphis, 1846; was made bishop of St. Paul, 1859; in 1884, Bishop Grace celebrated his silver jubilee; he resigned his see the same year, and was made titular bishop of Mennith, and was subsequently elevated to archiepiscopal rank with the titular see of Siunea.

Heilman, Rev. Lee Mechling (Lutheran), *D.D.*, at West Palm Beach, Fla., Mar. 10, aged 51. He was born of German parentage in Armstrong Co., Pa.; was graduated from Leechburg Academy, 1866; Gettysburg College, 1868, and Gettysburg Theological Seminary, 1871; was ordained the same year to the charge at Springfield, Ill.; removed to the pastorate of the Foster Street Church, Harrisburg, Pa., 1873; there he labored

with success for nine years; he was then asked to take up the work of the English Lutheran Mission in Chicago, which he did in 1882, and succeeded in building Grace English Lutheran Church there; after fourteen years' work there he was recalled, in 1896, to the Memorial Church (Old Foster Street), Harrisburg; he was still pastor there when death ended his labors.

Hoffman, Rev. Charles Frederick (Protestant Episcopal), *D.D.* (Rutgers College, St. Stephen's College, N. Y.), *LL.D.* (Hobart College), *D.C.L.* (St. Stephen's College, University of the South), at Jekyl Island, Ga., Mar. 4, aged 67. He was born in New York City; was educated at Rutgers and Trinity Colleges; was rector successively of St. Mary's Church, Burlington, N. J.; of St. Philip's-in-the-Highlands, Garrison, N. Y.; and, in 1873, of All Angels, New York City. Dr. Hoffman and his brother, the Dean of the General Theological Seminary, inherited very large fortunes, out of which both have made very large benefactions to educational and charitable institutions; he was a trustee of St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y., and vice-chancellor of Hobart College, N. Y.

Kellogg, Rev. Erastus Martin (Presbyterian, Congregationalist), in Wolcott, Conn., Mar. 1, aged 82. He was born in Richland, N. Y.; was a graduate of Hamilton College; studied theology at Auburn Theological Seminary; was ordained and installed over the Presbyterian Church in New Haven, N. Y.; his next pastorate was at New Boston, N. H., over the

Presbyterian Church there; he removed some years later to the care of the Congregational Church at Greenville, N. H.; in 1855 he partially lost his voice, and the next year received severe injuries in a railroad accident, which laid him up for years; in 1866 he bought a drug store in Manchester, N. H.; re-entered the pastorate in the Congregational Church at Lyme, N. H., 1870; removed to New Jersey in 1873, and had charge successively of the Presbyterian churches at Manchester and Hammoncton; retired to Manchester, N. H., in 1879, where his wife died, 1891, when he went to live with his only son, at whose home he died.

Koehler, Rev. August (German Lutheran), *Ph.D.* (Jena, 1856), *Lic.Theol.* (Erlangen, 1857), *D.D.* (Erlangen, 1864), in Erlangen, Feb. 17, aged 62. Dr. Koehler studied at Bonn, Erlangen, and Utrecht, 1851-55; became *privat-docent* at Erlangen, 1857; professor-extraordinary of theology, 1862; professor ordinary at Jena, 1864; at Bonn, 1866; at Erlangen, 1868. He has written a number of learned works on "The Reformed Church of the Netherlands," "Commentary on the Post-Exilic Prophets," "The Biblical History of the Old Testament," etc.

Mills, Rev. Josias Grant (Anglican), *M.A.*, at Seaford Cliff, Eng., Feb. 19. Mr. Mills was a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, 1870; was ordained the following year curate of Holy Trinity, Eastbourne; became curate of Christ Church, Folkestone, 1873; and of Dedham, Essex, 1875; was made vicar of Manningtree, 1876;

removed to London to charge of Clare Market Mission, 1878; was appointed Chaplain of St. Thomas' Hospital, 1880. Mr. Mills' death appears to have been caused by a fall from the cliffs, as his body was found at the foot, terribly bruised. He was subject to heart disease, and probably fell in a faint from the top. He was a noted temperance worker.

Phillips, Very Rev. Evan O. (Anglican), at Aberystwith, Wales, Mar. 2, aged 80. He was a graduate from Cambridge, 1840, taking rank as eighteenth Wrangler; was appointed immediately warden and headmaster of Llandowery School; resigned to become vicar of Aberystwith, 1861, where he had since remained; was made dean of St. David's, 1895.

Plunket, Most Rev. and Rt. Hon. William Conyngham (Anglican), *D.D.* (Trinity College, Dublin, 1876), in Dublin, Apr. 1, aged 69. He was the second son of Lord Plunket; was born in Dublin, 1828; was graduated from Trinity College, Dublin, B.A., 1853, M.A., 1864; was ordained deacon, 1857, and priest, 1858; became rector of Kilmoylan and Cummer, Tuam, 1858; chaplain and private secretary to the bishop of Tuam, and treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral, 1864; succeeded to the title of Lord Plunket, 1871; was made precentor of St. Patrick's, 1869; consecrated bishop of Meath, 1876; translated archbishop of Dublin, 1884.

Wells, Rev. George H. (Congregationalist), at Wauwatosa, Wis., Mar. 15, aged 65. He was born in New York; dur-

ing his boyhood his family emigrated to Illinois; he was graduated from Amherst College, 1863, and from Chicago Theological Seminary, 1867; became pastor at Amboy, Ill., the same year; accepted pastorate of a Presbyterian Church in Montreal, Canada, 1870; removed to charge of Plymouth Church, Minneapolis, 1891, resigning in 1895 because of ill health. He went with his brother to the sanitarium at Wauwatosa, Wis., the day of his death, and appeared content to stay there. But in the evening he appears to have slipped out with his hand-bag, and to have been killed by being struck by a locomotive.

Adams, Rev. Frank S. (Congregational), at Reading, Mass., Mar. 9.

Bartholomew, Rev. Thomas D. (Presbyterian), in Highland, Mich., Mar. 12, aged 68.

Bierce, Rev. Daniel E. (Presbyterian), in Cleveland, O., Mar. 2, aged 63.

Blumenfeld, Rev. David (German Presbyterian), in Pleasantdale, N. J., Feb. 16, aged 39.

Brewer, Rev. E. Cobham (Anglican), *LL.D.* (Cambridge University, 1840), at Edwinstowe, Eng.

Candlish, Rev. James Smith (Free Church, Scotland), *D.D.*, in Glasgow, Scotland, Mar. 7, aged 68.

Copeland, Rev. A. T. (Methodist Episcopal), at Girard, Pa., Feb. 21, aged 66.

Dunning, Rev. Homer Northrup (Congregational), at South Norwalk, Conn., Mar. 27, aged 70.

Evans, Rev. John (Baptist), at

Westerly, R. I., Mar. 22, aged 54.

Farnham, Rev. Luther (Congregational), in Boston, Mar. 15, aged 81.

Frambes, Rev. D. E. (Methodist Episcopal), at Port Oram, N. J., Mar. 26.

Holmes, Rev. Charles Avery (Methodist Episcopal), at Beaver, Pa., Mar. 15.

Hunter, Rev. Robert (Free Church of Scotland), *LL.D.*, at Forest Retreat, Epping Forest, Eng., aged 74. He was chief editor of the Encyclopædic Dictionary.

Koch, Rev. Herman A. (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.*, in Chicago, Mar. 13. Dr. Koch had been for thirty-two years president of the German Central Wesleyan College.

Lewars, Rev. W. H. (Lutheran), at Annsville, Pa., Mar. 18, aged 48.

McCauley, Rev. James M. (Presbyterian Missionary), in Tokio, Japan, Feb. 10, aged 51.

Marshall, Rev. John (Presbyterian), at Knoxville, Tenn., Mar. 13.

Menaul, Rev. James A. (Presbyterian), at Albuquerque, N. M., Mar. 14, aged 55.

Mower, Rev. Samuel (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.*, in Cleveland, O., Mar. 24, aged 76.

Murphy, Rev. Joseph M. (Roman Catholic), in Philadelphia, Pa., Mar. 26, aged 50.

Pratt, Rev. Horace L. Edgar (Protestant Episcopal), in New York City, Mar. 25, aged 75.

Richards, Rev. S. (Presbyterian), *D.D.*, Waynesville College, Pa., Mar. 24, aged 62.

Smith, Rev. James (Church of Scotland), *D.D.*, at Cathcart, Scotland, aged 94.

Sutphen, Rev. David Schuerman (Dutch Reformed), in Bloomfield, N. J., Mar. 27, aged 55.

Tullidge, Rev. Henry (Protestant Episcopal), *D.D.*, in West Philadelphia, Mar. 18, aged 85.

Wortmann, Rev. M. L. (Presbyterian), in Allegheny, Pa., Mar. 7, aged 70.

CALENDAR.

[The compiler will welcome notices of meetings of general importance and interest, provided such notices reach him before the 10th of the month prior to that in which the meetings are to take place. Exact dates and names of places, when and where the meetings are to be held, are desired.]

May 2-5.—Annual Meetings of the *Cumberland Presbyterian Woman's Board of Missions*, at Fort Worth, Tex.

May 4-7.—*Summer School of Theology* under the auspices of the united faculties of the Presbyterian Seminary at San Anselmo, Cal., and the Congregational Seminary at Oakland, Cal., in San Francisco.

May 7.—Fortieth Annual Convention of the *Southern Baptists*, in Wilmington, N. C.

May 9-10.—Seventieth Annual Meeting of the *Protestant Reformation Society*, in London, Eng.

May 13.—Session of the *Colored Cumberland Presbyterian General Assembly*, at Bowling Green, Ky.

May 17-24.—National Baptist Anniversaries at Pittsburg, Pa.

May 18-20.—*National "Good Citizens" Convention*, at Nashville, Tenn.

May 20.—One Hundred and Eighth General Assembly of the *Presbyterian Church, United States of America*, at Winona.

General Assembly of the *Presbyterian Church in the United States* (South), at Charlotte, N. C.

May 25-27.—Annual Meetings of the General Assembly of the *Welsh Calvinistic Methodists*, at Rhyl.

May 26.—Session of the *United Presbyterian General Assembly*, at Rock Island, Ill.

June 3-6.—Sixtieth Convention of the *Franckean Synod* (Lutheran), in East Schodack, N. Y.

June 5-8.—Seventh Annual Meeting of the *British National Societies of Christian Endeavor*, in Liverpool.

June 9.—Thirty-eighth Biennial Synod of the *Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States*, at Mansfield, O.

June 21-24.—Annual Meetings of the *Congregational Union of Wales*, in Liverpool.

June 30-Aug. 2.—*Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops* (Pan-Anglican Synod), in Lambeth Palace, London.

Christian Literature

*A Monthly Review of
Religious Thought and Movement*

30 Cents a Number \$3.00 a Year

*Advertising Rates on Application
Address all Communications to*

The Christian Literature Co.

NEW YORK

MAY, 1897.

The St. Denis.

IN a modest and unobtrusive way there are few better conducted hotels in New York than the St. Denis. The great popularity it has acquired can readily be traced to its homelike atmosphere and the peculiar excellence of its cuisine and service.

The Stearns Bicycle.

At this season old riders congregate and talk wheel before purchasing their new mounts.

A neatly dressed cyclist on a second-grade bicycle is a trial on the nerves. It is directly contrary to "the eternal fitness" of things.

The Stearns bicycle is a mount for any one to feel proud of, and it reflects toward its rider a certain air of high breeding.

Young men and riders who desire a particularly light wheel, and one with a distinctive touch of grace and beauty, should examine the Stearns Special.

The Living Age.

To American readers who have not ready access to the great bulk of the European periodical press,

continental as well as British (and who has?), there is no magazine that can take the place of the *Living Age*. The whole world of literature is its field, and its readers get the best that the world offers. For the busy man and woman of this living age it is invaluable.

Pabst Malt Extract.

WE do not wish to call especial attention to the advertisement of Pabst Malt Extract, The "Best" Tonic, which appears in this issue, for it is sufficiently conspicuous to make itself apparent. Its presence in this publication is permitted because we have investigated the matter, and find that the preparation is worthy of every confidence.

ONE result of Nansen's triumphal progress through Europe has been a remarkable increase in the membership of the different geographical societies. The *Berliner Tageblatt* says that 106 new members have offered themselves for election in the society there during the last few weeks, the reason simply being that by this means they can be sure of a good place from which to hear the explorer. In Copenhagen the Geographical Society has added no fewer than 700 members on account of Nansen.

OCTAVE THANET, Paul Dunbar, Charles Wagner, Justin McCarthy, Charles H. Crandall, and other well-known writers contribute to the *Outlook's* May magazine number. The reproduction of Watts's painting of Gladstone is the finest single picture of the more than fifty illustrations contained in this issue. [\$3.00 a year. THE OUTLOOK COMPANY, 13 Astor Place, New York.]